

THE
AMERICAN

BC

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantium sive confitentum.

S. AUG. EPIST. cccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME VI.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1881.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1881,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

70739

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Vol. VI.—JANUARY, 1881.—No. 21.

A GLANCE AT THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

NOT many years ago Dr. Draper, of the New York University, contributed to the International Series a volume entitled *The History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. In his strictures on the work, the late Dr. Brownson justly remarked that the author had, like the elder Disraeli, written a history of events that never happened, adding, in his own incisive way, that a "conflict between religion and science is something that has never occurred and never can occur."

It is true that between true religion and true science there can be no conflict; between true religion and what by a woful perversion of language is called science there not only can, but actually does, exist a conflict, and that conflict is "nigh even at our doors." On all sides are evidences of its proximity.

Nowadays every man that talks at all talks about matters of science, and because there is no law to prevent him from babbling scientific nonsense, he can see no reason why he should not also annihilate religion; nay, he fancies himself intrusted with a special mission, having for its end the total destruction of all religion. He may not always be quite sure about the truth of the science which he champions, but with a species of intuition which seems common to the *genus* scientist, he never has a doubt about the falsity of the religion which he is bent upon demolishing. From the scientist obscure to the scientist renowned, from the rural scientist whose novel theories are the wonder of his unenlightened neighborhood to

the ponderous names in a New England coterie, all feel that the complement of their career as true followers of science consists in utterly eradicating all vestiges of religion from the face of society; and it is no more than justice to say that most of them ungrudgingly expend a vast amount of zeal and energy upon at least the complement of their mission. They economize the time and labor, zeal and earnestness, which should be devoted to the actual study of the science they pretend to adore, in order to lavish them in unstinted measure in their warfare upon the religion which they manifestly abhor. That a false science should be habitually arrayed in an attitude of hostility to the Church is not to be wondered at, for this hostility is its very essence; but that within the last few years every individual follower of science should break out in active aggression is a curious fact. It is a fact, however, for which there is an obvious reason. For the last few years positive thought has been very busy, exceedingly noisy, and dreadfully in earnest. It has filled the world with untranslatable terminology. It has swelled the size of our encyclopædias and dictionaries. It has inflated men's minds and puffed them up with false notions of their own greatness. It has thronged our platforms with vapid orators, who propound foolish theories in unknown terms to astounded audiences, and these on their part applaud the loudest and longest when the language is least intelligible, and then go home to carp at religion and boast of the advancement of science. It has stocked the literary-scientific world with books, anthropological, biological, ethical, etc.; and these books are purchased and devoured by men who can with difficulty spell the sesquipedal terms of which they are composed, but whose greatest ambition is to be able to prate in the language of modern thought.

In this way positive thought has wrought incalculable injury to faith, and the injury done to faith is slight compared with that done to morals. On every side the pressure of religious belief is relaxed, and a removal, even the slightest, of the pressure of faith is sure to be followed by a proportionate slackening of morals. Many men have long since flung aside their faith in the existence of God, and many who yet retain their belief in His existence have long since lost all practical faith in His providence. Now men are men, and no longer children. They are perfectly able to act for themselves. To be taken by the hand and led by a divine providence would imply that they are either children or imbeciles, and against this imputation their whole manhood rises in indignant and rebellious scorn. They are impatient to shake off the hand, divine though it be, that is offered unsolicited, and manifest a disposition to rebuke the implied insult and condignly avenge it upon the head of the Being who offers it. Men have nowadays acquired too sturdy an independence to yield submission even to a Being to whom they

owe everything. Some are willing enough to allow Him to retain heaven as His throne, but His title to earth as a footstool they are prepared to dispute, and the time seems not far distant when the idea, already common to many, will be held by most men, that the earth is man's throne and the heavens his footstool. There is a universal tendency to exclude God from the concerns of the world altogether. Men are making desperate efforts to shorten God's right arm, which they formerly believed omnipotent, and to wrest from Him half His empire, over which, ever since He created it, He has exercised undisputed sovereignty. The lines are drawn, and the limits set beyond which He must not pass. Religion is His sphere, and to this men would confine Him. Its limits He must not transgress. Its boundary line He must be careful not to overstep. Any interference on the part of God in the affairs of men would be resented as an unwarrantable intrusion. Outside of religion all is man's. There man is sovereign and supreme lord. There all is man's enterprise. The whole is his undisputed empire; or, if he is willing to share his dominion with a colleague, he retains the throne and crown, bestows the sceptre, and at the name of his adopted associate in power every knee must bend, for the colleague is *Science*.

And even in religion God's place is gradually narrowing, and He is hourly in danger of being supplanted by an impersonal god,—Morality. Men have made to themselves the image and likeness of everything that is in the heavens above and the earth beneath, raised them upon their altars, adored and worshipped them, and this too with an unerring regularity worthy the idolatrous lapsings of the ancient Israelites. All this, though much, is yet but a tithe of the injury done to faith. It is the disease in its mildest form, and where the vital principle of belief in God's existence is yet intact. Side by side with the question of faith, and shadowing it as closely as the shadow follows substance, runs the question of morals. Already we are left a shattered faith in the deep-meaning things of life; and when the deep-meaning questions of life lose all meaning, the grave questions of morality, whose existence hangs upon them, must of necessity lose their meaning also. Thus it is that the influence of "modern thought" is felt in houses where the language of modern science would be a "tongue unknown," and that the successful leaders of advanced thought are at least indirectly responsible for actions committed by men to whom their theories would be a meaningless jargon, and to whom the names of Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Darwin, Helmholtz, or Virchow might mean anything from a leader of advanced thought to a Choctaw or Cheyenne chief. The widespread evil of uprooted faith in God and conscience has filtered down from rank to rank, from class to class, until it has a certain bearing upon most actions

of daily life. The good ship Faith, once riding firmly and steadily amid the waves of human opinion, was freighted with a precious, sacred cargo,—Morality; but the tempest has lashed her sides, waves have rolled over her, a large portion of her precious freight has been hopelessly wrecked, and many men struggling in the surf, with honest purpose and noble endeavor, are buffeted, and all their efforts paralyzed by floating fragments from the wreck of ruined morality. There is no need of facts to verify this sad view of things. We have but to place a hand on the pulse, or lay an ear close to the abnormal beatings of the heart of the religious and moral feeling, and we shall find the symptoms to be such that the most skillless of charlatans cannot err in his diagnosis, or fail to ascribe the disease to its real cause. It would be strange if the Church should idly look on and witness the domain of faith and morals thus devastated, and raise not an arm to save them. It would be a betrayal of her trust should she with listless indifference behold an open foe make such sad havoc in the very province of which she is the divinely appointed guardian.

Already the first effects of the first movement are perceptible. The whole moral world is likely to be thrown into chaos and confusion unless the Church steps in and checks the threatening ruin. Not only is vice making daily encroachments upon the province of virtue, but virtue must be very prudent in its behavior or it will be decried and censured as vice. The line beyond which virtue becomes vice was never before chalked so far within the territory of virtue; the line beyond which vice ceases to be blameless was never drawn so near the fountain-head of vice. Never, in the opinions of men, did vice lean so closely to virtue's side; never had virtue so much to fear from a censorious world. Men's minds were never so divided about the point where purity ceases to be a virtue, and charity ceases to be praiseworthy. Up to a certain point impurity will be frowned upon, but there is a point, too, beyond which the world has learned to look upon purity as a virtue of doubtful merit. Charity, up to a certain point, will be extolled, but one step beyond, and it is apt to be hissed as folly or philanthropy run mad; and little danger is there at the present day that humility will be pressed into heroics or purity into celibacy. The higher and holier sanction of morality (the sanction of eternal reward and punishment) the present age has entirely eliminated; it has retained what it considers the manlier and more effectual one,—humanity. And thus we find the virtue of the present day precisely the same as the virtue of ancient Paganism. Virtue is no longer practiced for its own sake. People are virtuous not from a love of virtue, but because it is yet their interest. The rule of conduct has been appositely termed the "calculation of consequences." The cultivation of virtue for its own sake, or for any eternal reward

it brings, is a remnant of an obsolete religionism. The only things sought after for their own sake are money and pleasure. Virtue and morality are pursued merely to the bounds of advantage or convenience. Only their shadows remain; the substance has long since passed away. And that even the phantom of morality is allowed to remain is due to a very simple reason. The inevitable pressure of proof deduced from experience shows that morality is the only safeguard of order, and hence the necessity of its existence in the world; but come forward with a new entity which will preserve order and yet give free scope to licentiousness and immorality, or show that the world would be quite as well off without either morality or order, and this morality, which to-day is nominally sanctioned, will to-morrow be dethroned, degraded, and despised. Its imperative necessity in the world, as the only force competent to cope with anarchy and chaos, and capable of maintaining order in human affairs, is the only thread upon which hangs its existence, and hence it is not for its own sake, but for the sake of the order so helplessly dependent upon it, that it is, not indeed practiced, but countenanced in the world.

Indeed, from the necessity of their position, the *positivists*, to be consistent, should abolish morality. The code of Sinai retained when the Lawgiver of Sinai is abolished will, to say the least, be a strange anomaly. A code of ethics based upon a belief in God and the responsibility of creatures to Him, must be strangely out of place in a creed which makes merry over the absurdity of such a belief and treats it as an old wife's tale. Surely, to be consistent, they must demolish the structure when they have razed the foundations, and if they will not it is likely to topple of itself. A cloud has already cast its shadow over the old-time ethics. With radical changes in human beliefs, it would be strange if radical changes in ethics should not be introduced all around us. A new basis must be sought upon which to found ethical codes if the old one has been discovered to be resting on a foundation of sand. The positivists themselves seem to be fully aware of this, and already the first steps seem to have been taken to draw up a new code of morality. The revolution in morals seems to have already taken its soundings. Points which were always looked upon as irrevocably fixed begin to be questioned. The war has already attacked the outposts, and it seems but a question of time until every single point in the ancient order of ethics will have to fight for its existence. With Herbert Spencer and the whole ethical, medical, and philanthropic wings of positivism grandly questioning whether it were not charity to kill a person afflicted with an incurable disease—a work of corporal mercy, in certain cases, not indeed to feed the hungry, but to put them beyond reach of all hunger or the necessity

of food—a new code of ethics seems fast springing up, in which we may look for an entirely new set of cardinal virtues, in which suicide is likely to rank as an act of heroic valor, and homicide, in many cases, as an act of heaven-born charity. And thus we shall have the doors open to crimes which can strut in the guise of virtue, and more crimes committed in the name of charity than have ever been committed in the name of liberty.

Will this come? On all sides it is admitted that only one institution exists in the world sufficiently powerful to prevent it. This institution is the Catholic Church. Years ago Mr. Huxley told the world that the "Roman Catholic Church" was "the *one* great spiritual organization able to resist" what he was pleased to term "the progress of science and modern civilization." Now all the world admits the truth of Mr. Huxley's remark. The Church herself, too, fully realizes this fact; but in opposing "modern civilization" she is far from opposing the "progress of science."

Perhaps it might be said with truth, that for the third time in her history the Church finds herself called upon to confront an enemy which is not a rebel to her authority—an enemy which has come into existence, been reared, and attained its strength outside her dominions. Even Mr. Mallock from his stand-point will tell us that the Church is inclined to regard positivism "as a belligerent rather than a rebel." And, in point of fact, the movement of the present age can no more be said to be a revolt against the authority of the Church than was the Pagan element with which she found herself in conflict at her birth, or the enemy which she was subsequently called upon to combat in the followers of Mahomet. The attitude of positivism bears no shadow of resemblance to the outbreak of Arianism, Pelagianism, Protestantism, or Jansenism. Its apostles and disciples have never been in the ranks of the Catholic Church. In no sense can it be said to be a rebellion against her, unless in the sense that, like modern history, it is "a conspiracy against truth," whose claims upon mankind, like those of the Church, are universal. If there be a rebellion at all, it is a rebellion against Protestantism, not, indeed, in the sense that it is a rebellion against truth, but in the sense that the outbreak occurred in the ranks of Protestantism, and that its followers are drawn so largely from Protestant sects. Because it has pushed the pet principles of Protestantism to their most pernicious results it is none the less a rebel against it. A child is none the less a rebel to parental authority because he is heir to a stubborn disposition, and the example of rebellion has been set him by wilful parents. That he has bettered their instruction and profited by their example may be extenuating circumstances, but can hardly change the nature of the rebellious act. And that the leaders of modern thought have

but pursued to their utmost legitimate conclusions the favorite principles of private judgment and revolt against authority so dear to Protestantism, fails to lift them out of the rank of rebels to Protestant authority; if such a thing exist, positivism must then be looked upon as a rebel not to Catholicity but to Protestantism; but all the same it is Catholicity which must combat it.

On all sides it is freely admitted that the power in whose territory the revolt exists is utterly powerless to suppress it. At the present day there is no greater truism amongst the disciples of modern thought, than that Protestantism is entirely unable to resist its inroads. Indeed it is a commonplace which Protestantism does not take the trouble to gainsay. And within the last few years we even witnessed the phenomenon of the American world turning to Catholicity and holding out its hands to it for protection, when the worst terrors of communism—the legitimate offspring of modern thought—loomed up so ominously before us; so that the Church is called upon to fight not only her own battles against her internal and external enemies, but the battles of all mankind as well. She is called upon to conquer enemies found unconquerable by all others; and even those who centuries ago revolted against her authority must needs supplicate her assistance if they wish to subdue their own rebellious children. And thus we find the Church in the enlightened nineteenth century precisely what she was in the dark ages of the tenth,—the guardian of society and the benefactor of all mankind. Now she is called upon to marshal her forces against the serried ranks of what is pompously called “modern civilization,” and for many reasons “modern civilization” bids fair to be one of the most formidable antagonists which the Church has ever been called upon to encounter. Without provocation and without cause it proves to be the most bitter, the most malicious, and the most intemperate of enemies. The spirit which actuates it seems to be the spirit of heresy; the warfare it wages is the warfare of infidelity. It has something in common with every enemy which ever entered the arena against the Church; it displays an energy and a devotion which promises to labor “more than them all.” The materialism it advocates is the materialism of ancient Paganism. The barbarism it leads to is the barbarism of Attila and Genseric. The fierce and fiery fanaticism betrayed, at least, by those who might, perhaps, be called its lay disciples, is the fanaticism of the believers in the Koran. The vaunting boasts and the arrogant intemperance sound like the arrogance and intemperance of Martin Luther. The absurd and ridiculous guesses, the unfounded assumptions, are peculiarly its own. Mr. Mallock will tell us that it promises to revive the “buried lusts of Paganism.” We have only to take up the *Value of Life* or any of the effusions

of the female "scientists" to discover a more than Mohammedan fanaticism. Oliver Wendell Holmes would, perhaps, blame the science itself more than the followers of it for the propensity they manifest towards a braggart disposition; for he tells us that "absolute, peremptory facts are great bullies, and those who keep company with them are apt to get into a bullying habit of mind." And the same writer would probably assign the same reason for the intemperance with which the views of modern thought are obtruded upon us; for he says that "scientific knowledge" even in "modest men" partakes "of insolence;" and insolence we know is very nearly akin to intemperance. But while the present movement has so much in common with all its predecessors, it has an attraction and a charm peculiarly its own. There is no charge which a man, with any pretensions at all to knowledge, will repel with such spirit as a charge of ignorance. To be considered patrons, or at least abettors of science, seems to be one of the modern fashionable weaknesses. Perhaps this is the principal, if not the sole reason, why it is we find in the ranks of "science" in our day men of every hue of thought and every color of belief. We have scientists to whom science is their god, and philosophers who are ready to lay down their lives in the cause of truth; wild enthusiasts who draw rash conclusions from new discoveries; cool-headed reasoners for whom new discoveries are the confirmation of a life-long faith; men who are called credulous because they will not cease to believe in the existence of God; rash skeptics who doubt everything, even their own existence; morality-loving men whose irreproachable lives would be an ornament to Christianity; base libertines who make science their creed because it places no restraint upon their passions; earnest men in the pursuit of knowledge; frivolous men in search of novelty; good men in the best of faith, but who never possessed the gift of *faith*; bad men who possessed it but to abandon it, or clung to it only to outrage it; even strong-minded women who clamor for rights which most men seem inclined to deny them even as privileges; and weak-minded men who regard as privileges—and even then shrink from exercising them—what they might justly claim, and what all men would willingly accord them as rights;—all are to be met with enrolled under the banner of "modern progress."

The origin of Christianity has been compared with the origin of "modern thought" a hundred times. The noisy, pompous aggressions of the one and the humble beginnings of the other is an oft-told tale. The rapidity with which Catholicity gained the ascendancy over the world was a marvel, whose solution puzzled the minds of unbelievers in every after age; for neither its rapid growth nor the extraordinary ease with which it captivated men's minds

could be attributed to favoring circumstances. A metaphor of Lord Macaulay's on a different subject applies to it exactly. "The hardy plant" had but a "barren soil into which it struck deep its roots," and "an inclement sky" to which it "spread wide its branches." The famous words of Tertullian, "We are but of yesterday," etc. abundantly attest two things: the prolific growth of Christianity and the hostile elements against which that growth had to struggle. The sun of Catholicity rose indeed in the East, but to all the outer world the Eastern sky appeared overcast with the clouds of an unmeaning superstition. The nation from which sprang the strange being who claimed that He and the Father were one possessed no political prestige. The time was long past when the neighboring city of Tyre was the magnet which drew eastward the commerce of the world, when even Carthage was an emporium of Tyre, when the ships of Tyre were on every known sea, and the "ships of Tharsis" rode proudly into the Tyrian harbor. A time was when even Tyre herself might justly grow jealous of the commerce of Jerusalem; but now the nation itself was under a foreign yoke. The Jewish people were remarkable among neighboring nations only for their stubborn adherence, in spite of their former repeated lapsings, to the creed of their ancestors, for their manifold traditions concerning the human family, and their tedious, anxious longing for some one who was to come to them from Heaven as their king and deliverer. "Can anything good come from Israel," though not attaining the dignity of a proverbial formula, might express as much to those living out of Judea as "Can anything good come from Nazareth" did to those who lived outside the scorned hamlet. The founders of new creeds are not often visited with punishment, but the ignominy, the disgrace, the cruelty which the Founder of Christianity suffered at the hands of those He came to save is the most revolting in the annals of the world. The doctrine itself was a scandal to those for whom it was intended, and a stumbling-block to those to whom it was transferred. It was indeed "a banner with a strange device," for its *Excelsior* meant deeper in humility and mortification. Its greatest pride was to be possessed of the greatest humility; its greatest happiness to cut itself loose from the happiness of the world. Its greatest glory was to be buffeted to shame, and a death amid the most cruel tortures the most desirable end to a life which would be all the more enviable if chastened by a lifelong cross. The Evangelists of this creed were stranger if possible than the creed itself. Fishermen have never in any age been remarkable for eloquence, and the most notable school of logic is surely not a hut by the seashore for mending nets; whatever it might be at another time, it could hardly be so at a time when Rome was in the palmiest of its Augustan

days, and the Athenian Areopagus was the centre of all that was refined in art, in science, in literature, and in eloquence. Worldly influence or persuasive oratory can hardly be said to be the portion of the toilers on the waves, and to those who would not recognize the *digitus Dei*, but judged Christianity from a human point of view, it must have appeared the most supreme folly for illiterate fishermen from their boats and nets to arise and stay the world in its progress, to convince the inhabitants of Jerusalem that the *Man* over whom their cruelty triumphed was the God whom their piety should lead them to adore; to tell the world that its highest wisdom was the highest folly, and that the riches of poverty was not only the most desirable, but the only desirable kind of wealth. Strange that the logic and eloquence of the fishermen succeeded! Strange that it should to-day survive! But stranger still, and strangest of all, that it alone,—the folly and ignorance of the Galilean fishermen,—following, no doubt, the “advanced thinkers,” law of the “survival of the fittest,”—after encountering the shocks and surviving the ceaseless opposition of nineteen centuries,—should be deemed to-day the only combatant capable of confronting the boasts of a haughty, intolerant science, and that too at the very time when that science is at the summit of its power, when it has the sanction of names illustrious in literature, when it has surrounded itself with dignity and splendor, and when it has filled the world with the fame of great things achieved and mighty things accomplished in its name. To-day modern thought stands at the circumstantial antipodes of Catholicity at its birth. Never was doctrine preached or theory promulgated under more favorable auspices. It has all the prestige of great leaders, and all the sanction of important discoveries. It has all the *éclat* which science can give, and every new discovery is made to serve as a new proof of this new doctrine. To take the world captive seems to be its mission, and every new development of science, while it has the confirming force of a miracle, is a new fortress erected within its boundary and a solid breastwork behind which it can intrench itself. Protestantism has been the Baptist to prepare the way and make straight the paths of the new Evangelists. Protestantism as surely prepared the way for positivism as Tractarianism prepared the way in England for Catholicity, and more surely than Evangelicalism prepared the way for Tractarianism. The age in which it asks for a hearing has all the credit of being Christian and all the advantage of being Pagan. The lamented Dr. Marshall aptly styled it an age of “intellectual presumption in the few and intellectual servility in the many.” The strings of religious feeling, as well as of religious belief, seem to have run loose. The mechanism of the various sects has long since run down. Since John Wesley appeared on

the scene there has been no thorough winding up of religious sentiment, and the unstrung mechanism woos every breeze that blows. The trumpet is not only liable at any moment to give an uncertain sound, but has already frequently emitted sounds calculated to inspire anything but confidence or certainty. The pillars of ancient sanctuaries, long supposed to be the abiding home of the Holy of Holies, are tottering to their very foundations, and the edifices which they supported reel and stagger. The creeds of the various sects have shifted their principles from point to point, from basis to basis. Like the dove from Noah's ark, they fail to find a solid resting-place. They seem to have discovered the fact, which they are unwilling to admit even to themselves, that there is but one solid foundation upon which to build a religious faith; but this is preoccupied by the Catholic Church, and rather than make common cause with an enemy which they have for so long a time alternately tried to ridicule and affected to despise, they prefer to "perish in the flood."

The doctrine of positivism has, though old, all the charm of novelty, and all the attractiveness of liberty of action. There are no hateful penances or groaning mortifications in its creed, and no ugly conflicts with enemies, all the more to be dreaded because unseen. If it cuts off all hope of happiness in the next life, it also cuts off the chances of misery, and for the loss of future happiness it amply compensates by holding out to us a brimming cup of present pleasures, if we can command them. And surely the man must have his own peculiar views of the latitude requisite in a moral code who would find fault with the narrowness of the morality which tells him, in the language of one of Moleschott's disciples (quoted by Archbishop Vaughan), that "the moral rule for each man is given by his own nature only, and is, therefore, different for each individual;" and which makes excesses and passions "but a larger or smaller overflowing of a perfectly legitimate impulse." The apostles of positive thought, unlike those of early Catholicity, are men of refinement and learning, leaders of thought, and in many instances models of culture. They are for the most part men of unquestionable morals as well as of unquestionable talents. Their brows are already bound with the bays of victory, and their theories at one bound take the foremost place in the van of "progress." All who have no ambition to wear the brand of ignorance must follow in the ranks and march under their banners. They wave their ensigns, display their proudest triumphs, and point to science as the god in whose presence all those who wish to escape the stigma of superstition must bow. Enthusiastic with the wonderful result of their recent researches, and intoxicated with the success of recent discoveries, they have already grown insolent

with the confidence of ultimate as well as present success. Having wrested from nature so many of her secrets, and emboldened by the fact that all who have hitherto opposed them have from open foes become warm allies, with a glow of anticipated triumph and a *nonchalant* air of certainty of the result, they shrink not from encountering the veteran Church of a thousand battlefields. She, on her side, is far from shrinking from the contest. She knows it is the old, old story, long since learned by rote from constant repetition. Every fledgling science, every new-born theory, every homespun novelty bids the spouse of Christ quake and tremble. They threaten to unmask her hypocrisy, or set her aside as a superannuated dotard, who has long since outlived her usefulness, if she ever had been of use. They make loud and jeering boasts about unravelling her superstitions, and threaten to hold her up as a laughing-stock to the gaze of the world upon which she so long imposed by claiming for herself a mission which she pretended was divine. They have again and again assembled around her to witness the positions she would assume in falling and dying; and often so certain were they that her end was at hand, that they only hoped that it might not be too sudden, but that they might have ample time to leisurely view the last moments of the expiring gladiator. But she knows she has always conquered her enemies, as Mr. Lecky tells us she conquered the world "in the very hour" in which they were "supreme," and that she has always had the solemn satisfaction of performing for all of them the last sad rites, which each in turn was only too courteously anxious to perform for her. Now, too, she does not fail to see that the self-assured confidence of positive thought is but a childish conceit. And indeed there is something provocative of a smile in the boyish glee with which every "victory" of science is hailed. Certain bodies are discovered to have certain properties, and to be possessed of those properties since their creation, and science becomes as great a braggart over the discovery as though it had imparted to these bodies the properties themselves. It has learned to classify, merely, certain minerals, or catalogue, say, certain diseases, and forthwith it expects mankind to look upon it with wondering awe as a power which can create and destroy at will, as a deity which must be propitiated and kept in countenance, lest in its anger it might inflict, and that in its clemency it may avert these diseases. The reason is discovered why an apple falls to the earth, and the world goes wild with delight, as though an apple had never fallen before, and could never fall again without the universal consent of all the scientists in solemn council assembled; as though man had not only discovered the existence but invented the law of gravitation; as though scientific men had calculated the equipoise of the world, and without

aid from any higher power lifted the poles of the earth lightly and easily into their resting-places. Science has achieved much, it is true, and we are far from depreciating the merits of *true* science; but in its intemperate zeal it forgets that in its various departments it can but be employed in discovering and classifying properties and objects which have been in existence since the very beginning, and that when it turns aside from its own peculiar domain to manufacture ethical codes of its own design and pattern, it must provoke the contempt as well as the censure of all truth-seeking men. But as Mr. Marshall has well said, "burrowing in the earth like moles, they (the scientists) persuade themselves they are soaring in the air like eagles," and thus as one of their own luminaries does not hesitate to say, "by invading a province of thought to which they have no claim, they not unreasonably provoke the hostility of those who ought to be their best friends" (quoted by Mr. Marshall from an address of Dr. Carpenter). It does not require, however, the penetrating glance of the Church to be able to see that the self-importance of modern science is the self-importance of the precocious youth, who has made the discovery that the object which he has hitherto looked upon as a single indivisible whole can be divided into many different parts. His conception of his own greatness knows no bounds, and he expects that others will regard him as a veritable Archimedes. This precocious self-sufficiency is really the greatness of its strength. The Church, however, holding in *her* possession the true secret of all the mechanism in the universe, is confident that in her hands is deposited the touchstone which will prove the infallible test of all their theories, and which, like the Lia Fail, or Stone of Destiny, upon which the ancient Irish kings were crowned, and which was said to emit certain mysterious sounds when touched by the lawful heir to the crown, is sure to show them to be either true or false, legitimate or spurious, when brought into contact with it. She is confident for other reasons too; confident in the weakness of her enemies' position, confident with the courage of a veteran who has never known defeat, confident because she numbers by the thousand the battlefields on which the victory has always been hers, confident when she reviews the once powerful but vanquished names enrolled in her archives, confident because, although almost nineteen centuries have swept over her brow, she feels not the decay of age, but thrills with all the athletic vigor of youth; but confident above all in the infallible assurance that she can never fail. With the pledged assurance of victory it is doubtful whether the conflict is really more to be desired or deprecated. Besides the certainty of victory, however, there are other reasons why the Church should be inclined to welcome rather than shrink from the advent

of the struggle. It is sure to prove the deathblow of the various sects now clamoring for an existence. It is fairly certain that it will clear the field of all the different sects which now cover it as thickly as ants swarm on a hillock. When the din of battle ceases and the clash of arms no longer resounds, when the smoke and carnage will have been cleared away, it will be discovered that the "thousand sects battling within one Church" will be found lying dead upon the battlefield or swallowed up in the toil and turmoil of the strife, and that vanquished *modern* civilization and victorious Catholicity will be left the sole survivors, to prepare for further conflicts or concert an amicable truce. Scientific infidelity and Catholicity will be the two extremes between which there will no longer be a mean. At present the long plain which separates the two belligerent forces is swarming with myriads of clamoring sects. The intervening ground is covered with a network of religious camps, which serve only to confuse objects, obstruct the view, and bewilder the observer. There is so strange a commingling, of such endless variety, that the ordinary mind can meet with only perplexity. All the different religious sects have some characteristics of both Catholicity and infidelity. None have all of either. There is every shade of religious belief, there is every shadow of scientific error. In some sects the religious coloring is deep and striking, in others so faint as to be hardly perceptible. In some it is difficult to separate positivism from religion, so close is the blending; in others it is difficult to determine the point at which positivism begins and religion ends. In some there are Catholic truths to be met with in all their force and entirety. In some Catholic truth is strangely mingled with error. In some error has entirely displaced truth, while in "other some" the foulest caricatures are held up to the public gaze as truth. Ritualism so closely counterfeits Catholicity as "to deceive, if possible, even the elect." Unitarianism verges so closely on infidelity that a Unitarian may be an infidel with a very little stretch and without a very great scruple of conscience. And all other *isms* fall into line between Catholicity and atheism, at proper distances apart and in due proportions. It is said that from the shaft of a coal mine hundreds of feet below the earth's surface the stars at midday are plainly visible in the firmament. At the present day it would be difficult to take a position on what a European writer has called "the lowest degree of mental objection," and from it descry the beauties of the "city seated upon a mountain," and the light of the world "which shines before all men." And the difficulties arise not from the city or the light to be discovered, not entirely from the disadvantageous depths of the standing-point, but almost entirely from the maze of tangled errors which inter-

vene. There are few whose glance is so penetrating, or whose gaze is so searching, that, like Mr. Mallock or Mr. Lecky, they can take their stand upon the plane of positivism or rationalism, and, piercing through the intervening labyrinths, scan with a just appreciation of its strength the vantage-ground of Catholicity. At present it requires rare acuteness of vision and clearness of perception; but the morning after the struggle the sun will rise upon a world from which every misty exhalation of religious error will have vanished, and like good and evil, truth as represented by Catholicity and error as represented by a false science will alone survive. The religious horizon will grow clear. It will be easier to storm the citadels of error; it will be easier to discern the fair proportions, the beautiful symmetry, the graceful edifice of truth. The atmosphere will be purged of vapors which serve but to blind and confuse. The sincere seeker after truth will no longer be deceived by voices calling to him from the depths "of the fog," which he found led him to dwellings as cold and cheerless as the fog in which he had been wandering. That this will be one result of the conflict is but saying what will, perhaps, one day be, if not an axiom, at least a postulate in the philosophy of history, namely, that all minor issues are swallowed up in great struggles. The disgraceful brawls of the Saxon Heptarchy were drowned forever in the conflict between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes. The feuds of the Irish chieftains and the faction fights of the septs did not survive the Anglo-Saxon invasion of Ireland. The quarrels of the Guelphs and Ghibellines were for four hundred years the scourge of Southern Germany and Northern Italy, and although reduced to the appearance of dying embers, they might easily have proved themselves but a slumbering volcano, did not the French invasion end them forever. The howl of the New England Puritan, the cry of the Know-Nothing, every discordant voice was hushed (never to be revived, it is to be hoped) in the thunders of Bull Run and the peace of Appomattox. What is true of profane is true also of ecclesiastical history. All Europe forgot its political and religious jealousies when the Saracens desecrated the shrines and slaughtered the pilgrims on the plains of Palestine; the revolution of the sixteenth century silenced forever the schism of the West.

Catholics can have little doubt about the result of the conflict. They have the Word of the Divine Founder that error can never prevail against the Church, and they have the confirmation of past history, which shows that error has never prevailed, and that the promise has never been made void. Already, too, are there human signs visible. In all the seeming strength of the enemy there is weakness—the weakness of division. There is division in the camp and disorder in the field. There are as many different sects in

positive philosophy and in the "scientist" movement as there are different elements in Protestantism. Like Protestantism, which is united only on the question of opposition to the Church, science in its various hypotheses has little in common, except the determined opposition to the idea of a God. Aside from this, the different shades of positivism are, like the sects, little more than a mass of jarring conventicles. "Schools of science are constantly springing up which, besides their rejection of God, have little in common unless they call themselves advanced." There are as many "variations" in the scientific movement as Bossuet could trace among the followers of the reformers, and there seem to be as many theories regarding the "origin of life" among the apostles of light as there are interpretations of the simple text, "This is my body." The utilitarianism of Bentham was moulded in the groove of John Stuart Mill, only to be derided by the disciples of Herbert Spencer. The data of ethics has driven the joint production of both from the field, probably to be ignominiously defeated by the coming volumes of the Rev. Joseph Cook.

The apostles of science seem also to be outstripped in zeal by their own disciples, and it would seem that this is because the zeal of the apostles has flagged through a loss of confidence in their position. Pet hypotheses are already spoken of with less confidence. The originators of the new theories are now less aggressive than their followers. The "uncertainty of these data" and the yielding of "only a provisional assent" are ominous words in the mouths of sturdy dogmatizers. The acknowledgment of their inability to prove that "life can be developed save from antecedent life," and that "against religious feeling the waves of science beat in vain," sounds like the prelude to a retreat. It is high time, as has been recently acknowledged by them, to warn the followers of a *will-o'-the-wisp* science that it is not admissible to represent conjecture as certainty nor "hypothesis as doctrine;" and it is more than time that they should "enter an energetic protest against the attempts made to proclaim the problems of research as actual facts and the *opinions* of scientists as established science." When they now attempt to do so their voices are drowned in a tumult. Their "energetic protest" is lost in the Babel of clattering tongues which their wild and fanciful theories have created; and when they wish to dismiss the weird spirits which they have summoned from the mighty deep, the evoked spirits show an unwillingness to depart. A lie travels faster than truth. The rabble will not be disillusioned. They have more faith in the new theories than in the scientists themselves; and when the same scientists, to whom they but lately listened so attentively, announce that "the failures have been lamentable, the doctrine utterly discredited," the disciples, lately

so credulous, shrug their shoulders in amazing incredulity. When Darwin cautions his followers against certain mistakes, and that one of the main principles of his doctrine does not work the desired result, such a renowned disciple as Stanley Jerome refuses to believe him, and confesses a readiness to swallow any amount of evolution physic. When Virchow announces to his German disciples that the theory of "evolution involves assumptions of which the proofs are still wanting," that "the descent of man from any ape whatever is as yet before the tribunal of scientific zoology not proven," Max Müller will tell us "he is howled down in Germany in a manner worthy of Ephesians and Galatians." And so it would seem that they have been at pains to needlessly raise a tumult which they now find themselves powerless to quell. The storm must spend its fury before the voice of even the magicians who created it can make themselves heard. Half-way they would try to arrest its course, but the current is broad and strong and deep, and there is nothing left for them but to wait "*dum defluat amnis.*"

Positive thought has labored hard and succeeded well in bringing discredit upon the beliefs of men. It has put forth the most gigantic efforts to upset the equilibrium of existing beliefs. It has taken from life all that men prized, and—no matter how much they may attempt to deny it—what they prized more than life itself. And what does it give in return? Nothing! Upon its own confession, mere guesses, mere assumptions, mere hypotheses. It is hardly just to trifle with a question where vital interests, nay, the *most vital* of all interests, are at stake. Others have refrained from preaching a new doctrine until, at least, they had found a substitute for the old. And no matter how distasteful these doctrines might have been, they always had the merit of being suited to their end and object. The worst excesses of Kniperdoling had a manifest aim, and the Girondists and Jacobins, even in the height of their maddened frenzy, never lost sight of their object,—liberty, equality, fraternity.

But here the very foundations upon which all men's hopes were built are levelled. The tree which sweetened the Marah of human ills is destroyed, and while we raise to our lips the bitter waters, with the sweetening influence gone, no other is given as a substitute. Or, if a substitute is provided, are we not privileged to ask what it may be? Will it supply the place of the old? It would have been at least philanthropy to wait till the golden calf was fashioned, until the molten figure was near enough to completion to warrant them in saying, "These be thy gods, oh! Israel," before we were called upon to destroy the gods in whom we trusted. It would seem that there are, after all, questions of greater impor-

tance than to know that lizards are great lovers of music, or that the tail of a lizard or leg of a frog if cut off will grow again. They are questions of the soul, of a future life, of an immortality, and, as far as the scientists are concerned, questions of such grave and awful significance are no nearer a solution than when the centuries were yet in their units. There has been a rumbling of the earth, which has displaced the fastenings and shaken the objects of faith on their pedestals, but we have made no further advancement in these problems of deep solemnity than when men believed the earth was a plane and that the sun moved round it.

And when science will have been fathomed to its very depths, when nature will not have left a single secret which science has not discovered nor a tangle which philosophy will not have unravelled, when she will have unbosomed to man her unnumbered mysteries of which she is now so jealous, when she will have taken him by the hand and told him of all her now hidden powers, when there will be left not a single work into which science will not have pried nor a fold of nature's mantle under which it will not have peered, when the philosophers and scientists will have unearthed stratum after stratum of yet undiscovered knowledge, and will at last have stood upon the hard rock of the last layer, these same questions will yet remain; man will be nothing more nor less than man, one of God's creatures; his relations to parent, wife, sister, brother will remain the same; death will yet be his inevitable portion, and after death, eternity.

THE JOYOUS KNIGHTS, OR FRATI GAUDENTI.

L'Istoria dei Cavalieri Gaudenti. Federici. 2 vols., 4to. Venice, 1788.

Cronaca di Ronzano, e' Memorie di Loderingo d' Andalò, Frate Gaudente.

Count Senator Giovanni Gozzadini. Bologna, 1851.

IT may be a not unpleasant diversion to the readers of the REVIEW to follow the writer of the following pages while he lays briefly before them the story of one of the most wonderful religious organizations of the Middle Ages, and describes his visit to the ruined mountain sanctuary which was the retreat of the heroic founder of the Knights of the Glorious St. Mary.

All who have read Dante's *Inferno*, either in the original Italian or in the English versions of Carey and Longfellow, have also wondered who were the *Frati Gaudenti* placed by the revengeful Ghibelline poet among the Hypocrites of the Seventh Circle of Hell. His meeting with them there, the fearful tortures which his imagination devises for them, and the conversation which one of them, Catalano Catalani, holds with him, form one of the most memorable passages in that book of horrors. Now it so happens that both of these knight-monks were the two most illustrious members of the "Military Order of the Glorious Virgin Mary," Loderingo d'Andalò, Catalano's companion in the above passage, being no less a person than the founder of the order. We shall see, further on, what unworthy feeling prompted the great Florentine poet to calumniate the illustrious dead. Suffice it to say here, that to most readers of Dante, in consequence of this misrepresentation, and of the very name of *Frati Gaudenti* given to his victims, they and all their brother knights have been, are, and will continue to be taken for hypocrites by the majority of Longfellow's Catholic readers, as they naturally are by all Protestants.

The name *Frati* or *Cavalieri Gaudenti* is taken to mean "jovial" or "joyous" monks or knights, men, consequently, who led a life of sensuality, merriment, or worldly pleasure, while professing the austere self-renouncement of the cloister. The fact is, that the Order came into existence in the same century which gave birth to Dante, and that the poet was in his manhood when Loderingo d'Andalò died (1293), beloved and mourned by his native Bologna and by all that was purest and greatest in Italy.

The history of this great man, and of the political feuds which he sought to appease, is a most instructive, not to say a most romantic, one, affording to American students one of the noblest instances of disinterested and self-sacrificing patriotism to be found in the annals of our race. The life of Loderingo d'Andalò was

alike one of heroic love of country and heroic love of God. It is a bitter, but most truthful, censure on the political passions of the Italy of the thirteenth century to say that Italy's greatest poet could not be just to one of his country's purest patriots.

These reflections crowd upon me at this moment and after a visit to Ronzano, the beautiful spot in which both Loderingo and his brother knight Catalano spent the last years of their glorious life, sorrowing over the suicidal dissensions which ruined all the hopes of Italian freedom, and ready with their associates to give their time, their labor, their lives at any moment to stop the fearful civil wars that raged on every side.

We had been invited to Ronzano by Count Senator Gozzadini and his countess (Maria Teresa de Serego-Alighieri, of Verona), descended, both of them, from Dante Alighieri himself, and who purchased the desecrated ruins of Ronzano in 1848, devoting their united labors ever since to rescuing from oblivion the artistic relics of both church and convent, and to restoring the fair fame of the monk-knights buried there and so grievously calumniated by their own ancestor. Of the visit itself, and of the treasures laid before us by our noble hosts, I shall only speak when I have sketched the rise of the Cavalieri Gaudenti, and said who their founder was.

The D'Andalòs were a branch of the great Carbonesi family, one of the most ancient and powerful of the many patrician septs of Bologna,—of Upper Italy, indeed. They belonged, moreover, to the Imperialist or Ghibelline faction in the deplorable Italian politics of the epoch, the Lambertazzi, their own near relations, being foremost in the horrible strife with the Gieremei, which again and again, during weeks and months, made the streets of Bologna run with blood. A sister of Loderingo d'Andalò, the blessed Diana, much younger than himself, had, about 1220, been induced, by the preaching and examples of the great St. Dominick and his companion, the blessed Reginald of Orleans, to devote herself to a monastic life. Her story, like those of many Bolognese maidens of her time, was one of strange romance and heroism. She applied to Dominick for guidance, and he, convinced that she was truly called of God, gave her the religious habit, or permitted her to make a simple vow of chastity, with a promise to become as soon as possible a nun. This was done without the knowledge of her parents. Meanwhile Diana had busied herself in Bologna in forwarding some monastic establishments which St. Dominick had greatly at heart, and the noise she thus made soon reached her parents' ears. They had other plans for their daughter's future at a time when powerful family alliances were more than ever needful as a means of political influence. They were indignant and peremptorily forbade Diana's pursuing her project, or wearing

any badge of the monastic profession. But women, particularly in religious matters, are sure to have their own way sooner or later; so Diana set about devising a plan which might get her beyond her parents' reach. She induced several noble maidens of her acquaintance to go on a picnic with her to the Augustinian Convent of Ronzano, some three miles to the south of Bologna, and situated on the summit of one of the high foothills of the Apennines. No sooner had they reached the place than Diana quitted her companions' company, entered the precincts of the cloister, obtained and put on the habit of the Augustinian canonesses, and refused to return to the city.

There was a great sensation in Bologna thereupon, and a great commotion in the palace of the D'Andalò. Her father and mother, with a goodly band of retainers, went forthwith to Ronzano, and forced an entrance into the cloister itself. The paternal hands tore from the unyielding Diana the odious vesture which she had assumed, and, as she would not move one inch to accompany her father, he seized her and dragged her perforce to the door, while she clung with the energy of desperation to everything she could lay hands on. In the unseemly struggle, it is said, one of her ribs was broken, and she sustained other grievous injuries. During a whole year she lay sick in her father's palace. But no sooner had her strength returned than she once more fled to Ronzano. There, at length, her parents were prevailed on to leave her. After a lapse of some six months she returned to Bologna, and founded there the Convent of St. Agnes, the first establishment of Dominican nuns in that city.

She was a holy woman; brave-hearted, and true to her convictions. She lived a life of active charity, and, dying revered as a saint by the city and neighborhood, was, by them, honored as a saint. We were shown her remains, one of the many treasures recovered by the zeal of our noble hosts.

To this retreat of Ronzano, forsaken by the Augustinian nuns, in 1265, Loderingo d'Andalò and his little band of heroic companions came in 1267. He was drawn to the spot, not only by the memory of his saintly and beloved sister, but by the solitude and singular beauty of the situation.

"And now," you will ask, "who was Loderingo d'Andalò?" and "Who were these Cavalieri or Frati Gaudenti?"

The D'Andalòs were descended from the great Carbonesi family, one of the most ancient and illustrious in Bologna. So greatly was an alliance with them courted by the most powerful Italian families, that when Loderingo married India Forelli, niece to Salinguerra, lord of Ferrara, he received with her a dowry of 9000 gold crowns, an unheard of sum in such cases in that remote age. So

greatly also was Loderingo distinguished for all the qualities of the warrior and the statesman, that, as soon as he had reached the requisite age of 36 he was chosen podestà, or chief executive, by many of the Free Cities of Upper and Central Italy; by Modena, in 1251; by Sienna, in 1253; by Pisa, in 1255; by Reggio, in 1258, and by Faënza, in 1262. To this last city, however, he did not go, as he had, after fulfilling his duty of chief magistrate in Reggio, publicly embraced his new profession of "Knight of the Glorious Virgin Mary," such being the formal title bestowed on the new military order.

Let me add here that, inasmuch as the avowed object of the founders of this society was to devote their influence and services to the pacification of Italy and the extinction everywhere of partisan passions and domestic strife, so Loderingo, even after his monastic profession, was called to exercise the supreme functions of chief magistrate in Bologna and elsewhere.

He belonged to one of the leading Ghibelline or Imperialist families, but, without foregoing his attachment to his own political predilections, he displayed, both in his private conduct and in his public administration, a temper so conciliatory and so earnest a desire of union and peace among Italians, that he succeeded wherever he went in appeasing the war of factions and in restoring concord and mutual good-will.

Indeed, the lofty patriotism of the man, his disinterestedness, his inflexible love of justice, his earnest piety, and the personal magnetism which he exercised on all who approached him, seems to have been shared by the members of his family. The fame of Loderingo's achievements as podestà in Modena, Sienna, and other republics, induced the Romans, in 1253, to elect for Senator, or chief magistrate, Brancaleone d'Andalò, nephew to Loderingo. The terrible severity of his administration, the dauntless sense of duty which made him beat down all opposition to the laws, all enemies of the public good,—the proud nobles of the great city hanged at the windows of their own palaces, and their castles razed to the ground,—are still remembered as an era in the troublous annals of Roman anarchy.

Nowhere, however, was the heroic character of Loderingo better appreciated than by those who knew him best, his fellow-citizens of Bologna. And nowhere did he and his brother Knights of Blessed Mary give more practical proof of the patriotic and religious spirit which was the very soul of their organization. Just as Loderingo was laying the first foundations of his Order in Bologna, the city and its territory were given up to the most desolating anarchy. The strife between the Guelphs and Ghibellines, between the partisans of the Free Republics and the Pope, on the one hand, and

those of the German Emperor on the other, had armed in Bologna one-half of the citizens against the other half. The friends of the Italian Republican League, headed by the noble and powerful clan of the Gieremei, daily fought in pitched battle against the Ghibellines, headed by the Lambertazzi. Bologna in the thirteenth century was a city composed principally of palaces, or fortified castles rather, each with its lofty tower, from which the family could sally forth to attack their neighbors, or within which they could withstand all assaults.

After the victory which had left King Enzo a captive in Bologna, and the death of his father, the Emperor Frederick II., the mad passions of the Bolognese rival parties broke out into a long carnival of bloodshed and lawless violence. To find a remedy for this, Egidio Foscherari, one of the most illustrious jurists and magistrates of Bologna, advised his fellow-citizens to intrust the government to Loderingo d'Andalò, who was a Ghibelline, and to associate with him, in his supreme office, another "Knight of the Glorious Virgin," Catalano Catalani, who was a Guelph. Brothers as they were in their peculiar religious profession, they were still more so in that pure spirit of patriotism and Christian charity which considered the national life as dependent on unity of belief and union of hearts and hands in working out the nation's peace and prosperity.

The result of their united labor was marvellous. They pacified the city, restored the reign of law, reformed the administration of justice, establishing the perfect equality of all before the tribunals, abolishing the use of torture, and banishing from the penal code all the barbarous enactments which disgraced the legislation of that age. They also made the most salutary improvements in the civil code, providing for the careful registration of all contracts, and bestowing on the magistrates ample powers for the speedy administration of justice. To strengthen the hands of the city government, as well as to prevent the return of the anarchy which had so lately dishonored Bologna, they organized a guard of 1200 citizens, who were to be the soldiers of the Mother of God, ready at every hour to rally round the magistrates and extinguish the first fires of partisan violence.

They began their patriotic labors in Bologna in 1265. In 1266 the citizens of Florence elected the two illustrious Frati Gaudenti, or Knights of Our Lady, to fill conjointly the office of podestà in the sadly distracted Tuscan capital. Loderingo and his brother Knight declined the perilous honor, but were constrained to accept it by the positive commands of Pope Clement IV. They obeyed without a moment's hesitation or delay, and set out for Florence

with hearts burdened by misgivings and fears, which were to be but too sadly realized.

And now we come to the deep causes of Dante Alighieri's unrighteous and unreasonable wrath against the Frati Gaudenti. In 1258 the Florentine Imperialists had made a desperate effort to recover their lost supremacy in the republic, and being defeated in their purpose were banished the city. It was the stupid, short-sighted policy of parties in the Italian republics to punish with proscription their defeated rivals, and thus, as in the Spanish republics of North and South America, a political victory for one party meant exile, confiscation and death for their opponents. It became a debt of blood which was sure to be paid with interest as soon as fortune changed. So, in Italy, as in America, liberty meant license, political ascendancy meant cruel revenge, and the energies which should have been devoted to the development of the incomparable national resources were consecrated to the savage vindication of old wrongs. Of course, national decadence and the loss of independence itself must ever be the inevitable consequences of such unholy strife, as surely as shipwreck is the fate of a vessel whose captain and crew fight among themselves when surrounded by breakers.

The exiled Imperialists of Florence, aided by German troops, and the bands of Manfred, King of Sicily, soon regained possession of Florence, after having made an awful massacre of their opponents in the battle of Monte Aperto. The families of such as did not perish in arms were banished from the city,—men, women, and children being driven forth, and their dwellings levelled to the ground. The Imperialists (Ghibellines) assembled at Empoli, decreed the utter annihilation of Florence, which was only saved by the courageous opposition of the great Farinata degli Uberti, whom Dante places in a burning tomb in hell, in spite of his patriotism.

Charles of Anjou, who was called into Italy to oppose the power of Manfred, soon restored the balance in favor of the Guelphs. But their administration of the Florentine Republic was so impolitic and so ruinous, that the citizens besought Loderingo d'Andalò and Catalano Catalani to come and render them a service similar to that just conferred on Bologna.

They organized, as they had done in their native city, a council of government, composed of thirty-six of the best men of both factions, chosen from among the patricians and the people; they also formed the latter into trade guilds, with each its standard and consul, binding the members to march at a moment's warning to help the magistrates in repressing the first movements of sedition or riotousness. In every other respect they labored conscientiously to

bestow upon Florence the same benefits which made their administration in Bologna most memorable.

Unquestionably both factions listened in the beginning to men so renowned for wisdom, patriotism, and piety, and they consented to forget their feuds and work together harmoniously for the common good. Jealousy and suspicion, however, soon crept in, and alienated from the two soldier-monks the confidence and affection of the Florentines. Thereupon came a brief of the Pope commanding the republic to expel forthwith the German mercenaries in the pay of the Imperialist faction. The Germans, unfortunately, had not been paid, and would not stir till justice had been done them, and then they and the Ghibellines rose in arms, and the city was once more a prey to military violence. The firm attitude of the two podestàs and of the armed guilds alone prevented Florence from falling a prey to civil war.

The Germans were driven from the city half by stratagem, half by fear. Loderingo and his associate, deeming their further stay in Florence to be productive of no good results, demanded of the Pope, and obtained, after a few months, permission to lay down their charge and return to the quiet of their cloister. They had succeeded during the interval not only in reconciling with each other many of the patrician families, between whom a deadly feud had subsisted, but this reconciliation was cemented by numerous matrimonial alliances.

Dante and some of his brother Ghibellines accused the two knights of hypocrisy, because, while professing religious humility, they had consented to exercise the highest public offices, and because, while pretending to practice poverty, they had preferred their own private interests to the public good. To this accusation Count Gozzadini replies that the statutes of their order did not forbid the exercise of such functions, but, on the contrary, enjoined on the members to make every sacrifice and effort toward effecting union and pacification. Then, they only accepted the call of the Florentines when peremptorily commanded by the Pope to do so. As to the charge of peculation or interested motives, it is refuted by the known character and entire life of abnegation and self-sacrifice of the two great patriots.

At any rate, they had no sooner reappeared in Bologna, than "these most incorruptible, peace-loving, and righteous knights," as the old Bolognese historian designates them, were again called upon to save their native city from self-destruction. In their supreme functions they were aided by another of the Frati Gaudenti, Michele del Priore. Their authority once more prevailed with all parties. There was a general reconciliation and an exchange of friendly pledges; there was a solemn festival in which all met in

the Public Palace, and bound themselves to be thenceforward true brothers and true citizens. To be sure, it was only a patched-up peace; but it was a new triumph of patriotism and religion over selfish pride and its kindred passions.

One easily conceives that such men as these, saddened if not, disheartened by the suicidal madness which possessed the Free Cities of Italy, should have yearned for the silence and solitude of such a retreat as Ronzano, where, in sweet communion with all that is beautiful, grand, and peace-giving in nature, the soul is so easily lifted up to nature's God.

And so, here in Ronzano, we can easily answer that other question: Who were the *Frati* or *Cavalieri Gaudenti*? Seven of his brother knights accompanied Loderingo to the deserted convent of the Augustinian canonesses. These were Loderingo's dear fellow-laborer, Catalano, Bonaventura da Savignano, an eminent professor of law, Fino dei Teusi, another famous jurist, Nicola Beccadelli, and Jacopino da Medicina. Some of these, like Loderingo himself, had wives and children. In most instances the ladies, after providing for their children, became themselves members of a religious community, thereby leaving their husbands free to devote themselves to what they considered to be the best interests of Italy and religion.

To say that during the first century at least of their existence this semi-military order was composed of noble men,—the very flower of Italian manhood,—is to state a fact vouched for by history; they all resembled Loderingo and Catalano, and gave their lives to the same patriotic aims. This alone goes far to tell us what these *Cavalieri Gaudenti* were not. They were not the joyous, rollicking lovers of good living whom the readers of Dante in the original, or in Carey and Longfellow's translations, conceive them to be. They were noble spirits who gave up worldly position, wealth, fame, family, and home, to put themselves in God's hand as His most devoted servants in binding up the bleeding wounds of their dear fatherland. We in America may think that they could have best served their distracted country by retaining their position in secular life. They thought otherwise; they were nearer to their own times, to the social evils they endeavored to remedy, and, being conscientious men, were better judges of the necessity and expediency of their conduct than we at this distance can possibly be.

But how came they by their denomination of *Frati Gaudenti* or "Joyous Brethren?" Most likely it arose in part from the official title bestowed on them by the Sovereign Pontiff in the documents approving or confirming the Order,—*Milites Ordinis Beatæ Mariæ Virginis Gloriosæ*, "Soldiers of the Order of the Glorious Virgin

Mary,"—partly from the many great immunities and privileges enjoyed by them, and partly from their white raiment, and the white ground of their shield, with its Maltese cross between two stars. They were either soldiers or men of eminent learning and authority, who gladly sacrificed domestic bliss to the happiness of Italy, and went joyously about their difficult and perilous labors. No one attached an evil meaning to the term *Gaudenti* during the age in which they lived. Historians have accused their members employed in high public office throughout the Italian republics of being unduly swayed by party passions and prejudices. This weakness, if proved, was a pardonable one in such an age. But no one seriously charged them with immorality or even laxity.

The order was divided into two classes,—the cloistered and uncloistered members. The former were those who led a life of strict monastic seclusion, unless when called on by the voice of their fellow-citizens to perform some great public service. This class numbered not only unmarried men, but married men also, whose wives had formally consented to their contracting monastic obligations. The second class comprised men who, while dwelling in the bosom of their families, held themselves always in readiness to act as peacemakers, protectors of the weak and defenceless, or to act in whatever capacity could most benefit any of the Free Cities of Italy. And these Free Cities profited largely by their devotion and disinterested services. It is a most instructive page in the history of Italy, although you must not expect such bitterly prejudiced writers as Sismondi to show either justice or candor in speaking of men whose motives and principles they are incapable of understanding.

In the eyes of the bitter and unreasoning Genevese writer it was an unpardonable sin to be even remotely connected with the Dominican Order. The atrocious character which he attributes to the holy founder of the Friars Preachers is admitted by the best Protestant scholars to be unsustained by any solid historical evidence. Moreover, the armed heresies which in Southern France and throughout all Italy threatened to upset the civil and religious order are very dear to Sismondi. The great mass of Protestants, misled by false statements, fancy that the pestilential and revolutionary errors of the Albigenses, Cathari, and Patarini are none other than the evangelical doctrines to which Protestantism attaches most importance.

The Christendom of the thirteenth century, however, knew it to be quite otherwise. The very fundamental doctrines on which the Christian faith and the society created by it reposed—those of the divinity of Christ and of Mary's divine maternity and perpetual virginity—were those assailed openly by the sectarians. They

wounded the Christian conscience and the Christian heart in what was dearest to both. For their persistency in upholding these heresies,—so solemnly condemned by the Church in her councils,—the Cathari and their connections had been proscribed throughout the Greek Empire. In Southern France and Northern Italy, where they had sought a refuge, these heretics had spread their doctrines, silently and secretly at first, till, emboldened by impunity and by their growing numbers, they openly denounced the existing ecclesiastical system, and called on the people to do away with both churches and churchmen.

We know how the masses soon learn to translate opinions into action. Calvinism boasts that the Cathari and Patarini of France and Piedmont were its own legitimate ancestors, who could not hide their light beneath a bushel. Certain it is that the subversive spirit of Knox walked abroad in both countries in the days of St. Dominick. The freedom which it asserted was that of subverting the whole established order. Was it wonderful that all those to whom that order was dear should resist by force what its enemies professed and endeavored to achieve by force?

In Italy, where the Free Republics formed a mighty league, mostly under the leadership of the Popes, to withstand the foreign domination of the German emperors, and to vindicate the right of self-government, the secret propagandism of the Cathari, Patarini, Albigenses, and Waldenses, or the open aid they gave to the Imperialist factions, inspired the party of freedom and religion with equal alarm and hatred.

"The Patarini or Paulicians," says Sismondi, "were very numerous in all the cities of Italy; this country was in all Christendom the least dominated by superstition, and there the spirit of free popular government had always discountenanced any one's being persecuted for private opinions. The Theodosian code had indeed decreed the death penalty against the professors of certain heresies, regarded as more heinous than others; but, even while these laws were in vigor, the bishops had constantly opposed their application."¹

The pacification of Italy, therefore, the uniting of all its cities and all its children in the pursuit of the same national independence, and the cherishing of the same national faith, became with such men as Loderingo d'Andalò the highest and most heroic of all purposes. Ghibelline as he was in politics, like all his powerful family and connections, and devoted as he was to the Imperialist party in Italy, yet what he had seen in his own native Bologna,

¹ *Histoire des Républiques Italiennes*, vol. ii., p. 71.

what he had witnessed in the various republics he was successively called upon to rule as chief magistrate, filled him with the conviction that the salvation of Italy could only be secured by quelling armed strife in the Free Cities, and by preventing the spread of the rampant heresies which ever tended to add the horrors of religious warfare to the inveterate evils of political dissension. He conceived that it was worthy of Italy's noblest sons and daughters to band themselves together in honor and under the name of Christ and His Mother, the august Parents of the great Christian family, and the Parents indeed of the new life for the entire race, in order to preach and inculcate brotherly love as the soul of liberty, and to spread the reign of Christian truth as the principle of permanent union of minds and hearts. Hence he wished to combine in one powerful society, extending its ramifications to all the cities of the peninsula, men and women of the world of the highest station and widest influence, priests and laymen eminent for learning, eloquence, and virtue; the lay element to serve as a mighty force in quelling civil discord and settling all disputes between citizens,—the clerical element to help, by preaching and persuasion, to withstand the progress of error and forward the reign of Gospel enlightenment. It was an organization destined to meet the urgent exigencies of the country and the age,—one of those creations of Christian piety serving a great providential purpose, and disappearing with the necessity which called it into being.

Considering the objects for which these knights were called into existence, it was a wise disposition to allow such of the members as could not well live permanently away from their homes, or could not lay down the burden of family cares, to live in the midst of their own household. They wore, nevertheless, the habit and insignia of the Order both in private and in public, fulfilled all the duties imposed on the cloistered knights, and by the very fact of their wearing thus everywhere the badges of their profession, they felt themselves bound to honor in all places both the one and the other. There is not on record a single instance of a Knight of the Glorious Virgin who disgraced his Order or himself by proving false to his vows, or faithless in the discharge of the high and holy duties assigned to himself and his fellows.

What is singular in the history of this noble association is, that they allowed ladies to work with them in the twofold labor of defending the glorious prerogatives of the Virgin Mary—her perpetual maidenhood and her divine maternity—as well as the quelling of all violence and dissension among Italians. It is known that many of the great-hearted women, who were the wives and near relatives of the first generation of Knights of St. Mary, followed their husbands, parents, and brothers into the cloister. India, the

noble wife of Loderingo d'Andalò, was so thoroughly penetrated with the religious and patriotic spirit of her husband, that, not satisfied with giving her full permission toward his becoming a cloistered knight bound by the solemn monastic vows, she became herself, as it were, the foundress of the female branch of the order. On the morning of the 25th of March, 1261, when Loderingo and his seven first companions made their solemn profession in the then new and beautiful church of San Domenico in Bologna, India, with other noble ladies, the relatives and friends of these soldier-monks, also assumed the religious habit, and took up their abode in a cloistered dwelling of their own, near the Church and Monastery of Santa Maria in Borgo Arrienti. In 1265 she made her last will and testament in the female convent of the order at Casteldebritti, near Bologna, which was then the residence of the superior-general of the knights.

It will not be without its proper interest to state here, that for upwards of two hundred years the great cities of Northern and Central Italy gloried in possessing branch-houses of both the male and female members,—all belonging to the foremost ranks of Italian society. They must have been not only blameless in their lives, but most useful and acceptable to the quarrelsome, passionate, and censorious populations surrounding them, to have won the admiration of all and aroused the ready censure of none.

Nor did they limit their efforts and their influence to the vindication of the great fundamental doctrines of the Incarnation—the very corner-stone of the European society of those ages—or to cultivation of brotherly feelings among fellow-citizens and neighboring republics; they were also patrons, and most generous patrons of art from the very beginning. All students and lovers of art in Italy have made a pilgrimage to the Chapel of the Arena in Padua,—the gem of Giotto's pencil, the beautiful creation of his Catholic genius and piety. He was called to paint it in 1304, just when it had been completed by its generous founder, Fra Enrico Scrovegno, a Knight of St. Mary. While at work on it Giotto was visited by his friend, Dante Alighieri, then an exile from his native city, and a warm personal friend of the painter.

What perversity of head or heart induced the poet to place Enrico Scrovegno's father among the avaricious in hell? If he had made of his wealth no less noble a use than his son was making when Dante received hospitality in the Knights' monastery at Padua, or when he could watch the progress of Giotto's inspired labor,—assuredly there was as little reason for calumniating his memory as there was for defaming Loderingo d'Andalò and Catalano Catalani. But I am anticipating.

Of the spirit of chivalrous magnanimity which prompted the

self-devotion of all these high-born men and women, who tried with their whole soul to glorify God and save their country under the banner of Our Lady, we may say what Lord Lindsay says of the great painter of Santa Maria dell' Arena, "The works of Giotto speak most feelingly to the heart in his own peculiar language of dramatic composition. He glances over creation with the eyes of love; all the charities of life follow in his steps, and his thoughts are as the breath of the morning. A man of the world, living in it and loving it, yet with a heart that it could not spoil, . . . his religion breathes of the free air of heaven rather than the cloister, neither enthusiastic nor superstitious, but practical, manly, healthy."

It was such cordial esteem of their private life and their public services which led one of the fathers of Italian literature—the very first who ever wrote in prose and verse in the language used by Dante—to exalt Loderingo and his followers by pen and word of mouth, then to become himself one of their number, and one of the most zealous propagators throughout Tuscany of the Knights of St. Mary. Guittone d'Arezzo died in 1294; he was, therefore, a contemporary of Dante's, though older. Besides contributing greatly to the increase of the Frati Gaudenti, he also built in Florence the Monastery of the Angels for the Camaldulense. We can say of him, as of Loderingo and his first associates, that his religion was enthusiastic without being superstitious or fanatical; that it was "practical, manly, healthy;" that he, as well as they, "glanced over creation with the eyes of love," and that "all the charities of life follow in his steps." Would not such men be worshipped and followed in the nineteenth as in the thirteenth century? Is not such religion that which our age needs so sadly?—"the religion of men of the world, living in it and loving it, yet with a heart that it could not spoil?" Heaven grant us plenty of them, not in Italy only, but in our own young and "practical" America!

We should, therefore, be far wide of the truth were we to picture to ourselves the Priory of Ronzano as a rendezvous for bands of doughty knights, armed *cap-à-pie*, now sallying forth with a long train of retainers, and descending to settle disputes in the troublous city of Bologna, or anon returning joyously with the sound of trumpet to their mountain home. In every priory there dwelt but a select few,—men chosen each from among ten thousand, and who dwelt among their chestnut woods and olive groves, singing God's praises together, and living a life of retirement, study, and prayer, until summoned forth to fulfil some great and urgent mission relating to the peace and liberties of their countrymen.

In such retirement, poverty, simplicity, and sweet brotherly union of minds and hearts did Loderingo, Catalano, and their associate

knights live, till, one by one, full of years, revered and blessed far and wide, they went to their rest.

It was with no small emotion, therefore, that I stood beneath the hospitable roof of Count Senator Gozzadini, surrounded by so many memorials of the heroic ages of Italy. The order founded by Loderingo d'Andalò could no longer render to the Italian communes the services for which it had been instituted when the Free Cities lost their independence irrecoverably, and became the heir-looms of the bold and powerful. The Frati Gaudenti died out without ever having been formally suppressed.

In 1429, during the war for the subjection of the Romagna to the Holy See, the army under Gattamelata devastated all the country round Bologna. Not one of its most revered sanctuaries was spared by the ferocious chieftains who were in the Pope's service, but who cared nothing for Pope, prince, or people. The Church and Monastery of Santa Maria in Monte, near the ruins of which I am writing these pages, the venerated shrine of the Madonna di San Luca, on the Monte della Guardia, the Benedictine Monastery and Church of San Michele in Bosco, were all spoiled and ruined by the mercenary soldiery. So complete was the destruction effected at Ronzano that nothing remained but the half roofless church. "The place," says the Dominican chronicler, "became a total solitude, the woods and undergrowth covering the entire hill, so that when we took possession of it there was nothing there but a wretched hut, fitter to be the refuge of wild beasts than the habitation of man."

It passed into the hands of the Friars Preachers in 1480. Instead of respecting the ruins which remained, with the tombs of such men as Loderingo and Catalano and the fragments of painting and sculpture spared by the hordes of Gattamelata, the architect to whom the Dominicans intrusted the construction of a new monastery levelled what remained, and rebuilt all from the foundations. Not only that, but Gaspar Nadi, the architect, had the entire summit of the mountain levelled, so as to make a vast platform. In so doing, most likely, even the resting-place of the venerated dead was not respected. A church, dedicated to St. Vincent Ferrer, occupied the northern side of the square formed by the monastic buildings, the portal facing to the east. A Corinthian peristyle ran round the three other sides. There was a spacious corridor from east to west, so disposed that from the middle one saw, across the deep valley separating Ronzano from the Monte della Guardia, the monastery and sanctuary of the Madonna di San Luca, and beheld on the opposite side, across another valley, the ancient Church of San Vittore. In due time artists came to cover the walls of both church and convent with the best works of their

genius, among them the blessed Jacopo da Ulma, a Dominican, the successor of Fra Angelico, who left behind him there two precious paintings. Indeed the entire church was covered with frescoes.

When, during the French rule, Ronzano became a casino, the Corinthian peristyle disappeared, the church was mutilated, a floor being laid midway throughout the entire length; the eastern end was alone reserved for a sort of chapel, and whatever paintings escaped the contemptuous neglect of the centuries following the *cinque-cento* were covered with liberal coats of whitewash. This work of whitewashing was done most artistically and thoroughly, "defying," Count Gozzadini says, "the acids and iron" used in the persistent labor of restoration.

To no more intelligent and loving hand could this labor have been intrusted than to this indefatigable scholar and his accomplished countess. For she has been, as in all else through life, so in his intellectual pursuits, her noble husband's inseparable and devoted companion.

We were not allowed long to remain in the waiting-room, but were ushered into the cosy study, where everything told of the refined tastes of the occupants: tables covered with books, manuscripts, and objects of *virtu*; beautiful flowers, fresh from the garden,—for the Countess worships flowers,—and other evidences of woman's industry and taste. The chairs, as well as the tables, had embroidered covers, the colors harmonizing with all inside and outside this laboratory.

A man of courtly grace; with a fresh, handsome face, on which old age has left no wrinkles, and as simple in manner and modest as a maiden, he was soon seated between us chatting pleasantly in French about the objects which had brought us to Italy, and answering my questions about local history and art with a directness and clearness which forced me to admire the well-cultivated and richly stored mind. Soon the Countess entered, quietly, her face all beaming with intelligence, and welcoming us to her mountain villa.

After an hour's conversation on various topics—a conversation to me full of interest and instruction—we were shown a portion of the building, and the church, as it has been restored, with incredible toil and patience, by Count Gozzadini. The room next to the study is a treasury of mediæval relics. All around the walls are emblazoned the shields of Loderingo d'Andalò and the most illustrious of his brother knights. The furniture, all mediæval and belonging to the ancestral homes of the Gozzadini and Alighieri, is in itself most interesting; the very cover of the great table in the centre, having a deep fringe of heavy lace with exquisite embroidery in colors, and claiming an antiquity I should fear to mention. There were watches four and five hundred years old, and pieces

of plate and jewelry which would have gladdened the eyes and heart of an antiquarian. I was, however, more anxious to see what remained of the church and its eight lateral chapels; and so, doubtless, the Count read in my telltale countenance.

He then took us into what was once the great central corridor. Count Gozzadini has managed to restore or to preserve the glorious double prospect, so that, standing in the centre, we saw toward the west the majestic pile of our Lady of San Luca, towering above the steep vine-covered gray slopes, and toward the east the villa marking the site of San Vittore. I was not prepared for this magnificent perspective, and the glimpse of the gulfs of bluish-green, which seemed to yawn before us at either end of the corridor, with the massive dome of the celebrated church looming up as the central point, filled me with an impression of beauty and solemnity I shall not soon forget.

Passing into the church we found ourselves in what may well be called a sanctuary of the relics of Christian art, so industrious and lavish has been the Count in discovering and purchasing, at any cost, the scattered remains of Ronzano's former artistic wealth, as well as other treasures which throw a wonderful light on mediæval painting and sculpture.

The Countess at once showed me the relics of the Blessed Diana d'Andalò, while relating the principal incidents of her heroic life. And then I looked around and saw the wonderful results of the patient investigations of our noble hosts.

What remains entire of the walls of the church shows that they had been frescoed in large compartments corresponding with the side chapels. Beneath the open roof ran a large frescoed frieze on a blue ground, with a beautiful scroll in chiaroscuro, inclosing fourteen medallions with heads of the canonized Dominicans, whose history was painted on the walls beneath. Everything which skill and indefatigable patience and perseverance could do to remove the overlying whitewash has been done, year after year, and week after week, by Count Gozzadini. Thanks to him, some of the compositions have been almost entirely restored, and precious fragments of the others have become visible, enabling the art student to trace with great probability the authorship and date of the work. As I intend to describe fully in a separate volume these precious remains of fifteenth and sixteenth century art, I must not weary the readers of the REVIEW by a further mention of them at present.

Let me add, however, that the painting by Filippo Gargalli of St. Vincent Ferrer miraculously curing a sick man, which adorned the high altar, and was sold at the time of the suppression of the monastery; has been recovered and restored to its place by Count Gozzadini. Every part of the present chapel is covered with rare

works of Byzantine and mediæval painting. The early Bolognese school of the thirteenth century is represented by three beautiful paintings of the illustrious Simone dei Crocifissi, so called because he infused into his crucifixions a novel grace, life, and piety never seen till then in similar representations of the Passion. Other paintings of the same and the two next centuries, by Bolognese and Tuscan artists, enable one to follow, step by step, the progress of the schools down to the age of Perugino and Raphael.

Two most exquisite works in *intarsia*, or inlaid wood, challenged our admiration in the midst of all this artistic wealth. They were the great abbatial chair and the bookcase which once stood near the lectern in the monks' choir. They are both the work of Biagio, or Blasius dei Marchi, who left more than one of his masterpieces in Bologna about 1539. The chair must be some ten feet high, with a canopy of inconceivable beauty of design and execution. Beneath the canopy is represented San Petronio, the Protector of Bologna, seated and holding on his lap a plan of the city. The Blessed Nicholas Albergati, one of his most illustrious successors in that see, is kneeling at his feet with hands joined in prayer. The relief is perfect and the whole work in an admirable state of preservation. The bookcase closely resembles, both in style, ornament, and design, this beautiful work. There are four inlaid compartments. In one—the furthest from the spectator—an angel with outstretched wings holds out a scroll with the words, *Beatus qui venit in nomine Domini*; above this is a cartel with these other words, *Te decet laus*, and the musical notes belonging to each of these anthems. In the lower compartment is St. John, writing his Gospel, with an eagle near him. The side compartments are landscapes with pretty houses.

These two exquisite works of the inlayer's art were alone worthy of a long pilgrimage, and would have riveted our attention for hours had we not been mindful of our kind hosts' precious time. In leaving this once beautiful Church and Monastery of St. Vincent Ferrer, we could not forget the many vicissitudes which had befallen the place and its successive inhabitants. The Augustinian Canonesses of St. John Lateran, its first occupiers, dedicated church and convent to the Holy Trinity; the Frati Gaudenti, or Knights of our Glorious Lady, dedicated it to Her; and the Dominicans who succeeded these named it after the great Spanish friar preacher. Vincent Ferrer was one who, in the century after the death of Loderingo d'Andalò, took up, with no little success, the life-work of the great Knight of our Lady. He, too, labored strenuously to reconcile Guelph with Ghibelline, and left peace behind him in the cities of Lombardy. On his deathbed at Vannes, in Brittany, he said to the magistrates who besought him to state his

last wishes: "The only favor I beg of you is, that you preserve after my death the peace I preached to you while living."

Who will raise up in Italy a new order of knighthood, enlisting, like the "Soldiers of the Glorious Virgin Mary," the very flower of Italian manhood and womanhood, whose examples and irresistible influence could reconcile their countrymen with the religion and virtues of their forefathers? Who will raise up a Vincent Ferrer, to thrill the entire peninsula with heavenly eloquence and the miracles of a heavenly life? God alone. May He save Italy.

THE ANTI-CATHOLIC ISSUE IN THE LATE ELECTION.

THE RELATION OF CATHOLICS TO THE POLITICAL PARTIES.

THE part taken by Catholics in the politics of the country is a topic more frequently and elaborately discussed by their enemies, than debated among themselves. Catholics lack entirely all general organization in this country, whether for purely church matters, or for education, whether parochial or higher. They have no missionary societies for home or foreign work. They have no general association for the relief of the poor, except that of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and this is an institution entirely different from the usual type in this country.

Politically we have no organization whatever. By a sort of natural law, Catholics with a sound system of ethics and a theology that recognizes man's natural rights, are essentially conservative. What the Declaration of Independence says of mankind at large, that "men are disposed to suffer while evils are tolerable, rather than right themselves by changing the forms to which they are accustomed," is essentially true of Catholics. Wherever Catholics are found co-operating even indirectly with radicals, it is a sure sign that there is something extremely vicious in the form or administration of government, something aimed directly at the most sacred rights of the individual or the family.

From this instinct the Catholics in the United States have been from the first strong adherents to the Constitution of the United States, and all the balances and compromises it contains, as the surest safeguards of the well-being of the country.

Without the Catholic vote in its favor that Constitution could never have been adopted. That Constitution has in many respects become a dead letter since 1861. Under the pretexts of saving the Union and war necessity, provision after provision has been violated by Congress and the courts. Under the cry of *salus reipublicæ suprema lex*, they have made party continuance in power the supreme law of the land. A strange example of this wanton disregard of the Constitution was seen in the action of a United States judge at the recent election, who issued a mandamus to compel election officers to receive the votes of non-residents of a State, although the whole subject of the qualification of voters is by the Constitution reserved in express terms to the States.

The mass of Catholics cannot, with their conservative views, watch without distrust the strides towards centralization and despotic power, steadily made by the Republican party. By a sort of natural law they are on the conservative side and adhere to the Constitution of the United States, with which so few of our public men show any intimate acquaintance, and to whose spirit most of them are utter strangers.

The Republican party has moreover steadily shown in its acts and not unfrequently in its profession a spirit of direct hostility to Catholics, and a sheer want of good faith in ascribing to us objects and designs, which we do not seek or uphold, and by thus exciting fears and distrust, they directly seek to put an end to the American system of religious equality, and make the Protestant religion theoretically, as it is to some extent practically, though illegally, the established religion of this country.

The country has just passed through an election which places in the chair, the Republican candidate for President, James A. Garfield. As on several previous occasions the vote of the country seems to have been against the Republican candidate; although under our complicated and unwise system, a majority of what has proved to be a puppet electoral college, confers on individuals the chief magistracy of the country and a place in its history.

The election has been warmly contested, when one side can claim a majority of voters, and the other a majority in the electoral college. The change of a comparatively small number of votes on the eve of the election in all probability changed the issue, and this was brought about by the introduction of the Catholic question into politics, not by Catholics, who did nothing, said nothing, asked

nothing, but by schemers who used an old bugbear, and found fools enough to think them honest men.

In our whole political history there is hardly a stranger chapter.

The election resulted in a disastrous defeat of the Democracy, and this was due to a skilful use of anti-Catholic feeling by the Republican leaders. While the Democratic party was badly officered and counselled, showing no skill or forecast in the conduct of the political campaign, the Republican party evinced all the shrewdness and tact that could command success. The election was evidently to be a close one, and after the October elections in Ohio and Indiana, even those least versed in politics could see unerringly that the State of New York would decide the Presidency. Both parties were required to exert all their energy, all their skill and tact to hold their usual supporters firmly in the party ranks, and to gain that large body which decides so many of our elections, the undecided, irresolute people who belong from principle to neither party, but who vote from sudden impulse based on some impression received within a few days of the time when they deposit their ballots in the box.

The Republican party embraces a large anti Catholic element ; a large body of fanatical or pretendedly fanatical clergy at the North are its earnest supporters. In fact, from the days of "bleeding Kansas" the party was built up mainly by the influence of Protestant pulpits, and since 1861 ministers by the hundred have left their pastoral relations to assume office in the civil or military service. This party is now the controlling party of the North. The press that exercises the widest influence is in its hands. The colleges are mainly Republican, and the common schools of the country have been manipulated by them, so that the schoolbooks impress on children from the time they learn their letters till they strut forth from college with their diplomas, the greatness of the Republican party, its preservation of the Union, while its prominent men are held up as heroes and patriots, and indirectly Democracy is depreciated and associated with hostility to the real good of the United States. We all know how these schoolbooks are made in the same way to assail Catholicity and fill the minds of pupils with false ideas of the Church, its history, its doctrines, and its practices. We all know how impossible it is for a Catholic to frequent the public schools, without imbibing from its books and teachers a kind of shame for the faith in which he was born : a feeling that prevents anything like a manly attachment to the religion of his fathers. All his ideas are biased and falsified. This is familiar to us as Catholics, and, when off their guard, Protestants admit that the public schools as now managed are a more potent weapon against Catholicity than the pulpits of their churches.

Four years ago in the contest for the Presidency there was a strong tendency to make an anti-Catholic element prominent in the Republican platform. The famous Des Moines speech of Grant, and movements to revive the Know-Nothing organization in the interest of the Republican party were undertaken earnestly. *Harper's Weekly* teemed with assaults on the Catholics, but the Protestant clergy and denominational press did not move. The Republican leaders seemed to hesitate. The movement would be a success, if it did not go too far. If allowed to go only so far as to tempt over the Know-Nothing element in the Democratic party, it would insure success; but if the movement gained such headway that the party which had already on one occasion nominated Millard Fillmore for the Presidency, should again select a candidate instead of supporting the Republican nominee, the scheme would give them defeat instead of victory as a reward for all their plotting.

But there was evidently some way of turning the anti-Catholic feeling to account, and the spirit of Machiavelli is not unknown in American politics.

The platform of the Republican party in 1876 had already said: "The public school system of the several States is the bulwark of the American republic, and with a view to its security and permanence, we recommend an amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding the application of any funds or property for the benefit of any schools or institutions under sectarian control."

These public schools are really Protestant, that is sectarian, so far as Catholics are concerned, and such an amendment might in some States be held by judges to close the present public schools as really undeniably and bitterly sectarian. This amendment might defeat itself by its hypocrisy, for unless they drop the mask and say openly: "Protestant schools shall be maintained at the expense of all tax-payers; no Catholic school shall ever receive State aid," these fanatics cannot feel safe. This is what they actually want, and we should omit no means to compel them to put the issue squarely in that form.

One unscrupulous enemy of Catholics, Dexter A. Hawkins, says: "However excellent a school may be, the mere fact that the course of study and choice of teachers are not under the control of the public school authorities, but are under the direction of a sect or sects, should of itself alone wholly exclude it from the public treasury. Let the same authority *support* it that *controls* and *manages* it." Now the public school authorities are really under the control of a sect or sects, and of course the course of study and choice of teachers. In some places, as in New York and some New Jersey

cities, they are under the control of the Presbyterians, elsewhere they are under the control of the prevailing Protestant sect or sects, and by his own logic they should be supported by those sects. The *New York Herald*, another bitter enemy of Catholics, recently proclaimed that this was a Protestant country, and that we were a Protestant people. The conclusion is that offices should be held by Protestants and the public schools be Protestant. This is certainly far better than the miserable hypocritical sham of saying "non-sectarian," when in their hearts they mean Protestant. If they are men worthy of the name, they should say openly what they mean. The *Argonaut*, of San Francisco, one of this contemptible class, said recently: "Where the Protestant church and the non-sectarian schoolhouse cast their shadows, wherever morality, industry, temperance, intelligence, and patriotism exist, there the Republican party has triumphed." To the writer's mind, the public schoolhouse was thoroughly Protestant and Republican, but he masks all this under the convenient pseudonym of "non-sectarian."

These public schools, mainly because they are associated in many minds with the existence and supremacy of Protestantism in this country, are an idol, to which thousands bow down in insensate worship. Is the idol deserving of the worship of a sensible people? Apart from the idea that they are a safeguard against the Catholics, few intelligent men in the country would support the system. In the oldest American Review, Richard Grant White, who is not a Catholic or with any Catholic leaning, has just sent forth an article entitled, "The Public School Failure." It is well worthy the consideration of every thinking American. Mr. White says:

"There is probably not one of those various social contrivances, political engines, or modes of common action called institutions, which are regarded as characteristic of the United States, if not peculiar to them, in which the people of this country have placed more confidence, or felt greater pride than its public school system. There is not one of them so unworthy of either confidence or pride; not one which has failed so completely to accomplish the end for which it was established. And the case is worse than that of mere failure; for the result has been deplorable, and threatens to be disastrous."

His arraignment of the public schools may be seen in this extract:

"Nearly four million dollars taken in one year from the pockets of tax-payers of one city (New York) for education, more than a million dollars paid to teachers of primary schools, and a similar expenditure throughout the State, and in more than half the States; and what is the result? According to independent and competent evidence from all quarters, the mass of the pupils of these public schools are unable to read intelligently, to spell correctly, to write legibly, to describe understandingly the geography of their own country, or do anything that reasonably well-educated children should do with ease. They cannot write a simple letter; they cannot do readily and

with quick comprehension a simple 'sum' in practical arithmetic; they cannot tell the meaning of any but the commonest of words that they read and spell so ill. There should not be need to say that many of them—many in actual numbers—can do all these things fairly well; but these many are few indeed in proportion to the millions who receive a public school education. They can give rules glibly; they can recite from memory; they have some dry, disjointed knowledge of various ologies and osophies; they can, some of them, read a little French or German with a very bad accent; but as to such elementary education as is like the foundation of all real higher education, and the *sine qua non* of successful life in this age, they are, most of them, in almost as helpless and barren a condition of mind as if they had never crossed the threshold of a schoolhouse.

"The testimony to this amazing and deplorable condition of the mass of the pupils of our public schools is so varied, so independent, and comes from so many quarters that it must be true; it cannot be disregarded. It is given by private persons, by officers of school districts, by teachers themselves; and it comes from all parts of the country."

"This is the intellectual result of the operation of our much-vaunted 'American' public school system during the last thirty or forty years. Competent observers in all quarters tell the same story. In the year 1875 it was officially recorded that the candidates for cadetship at West Point had shown a steady deterioration on thoroughness of elementary knowledge during the then last twenty-five years. It is needless to waste more words in setting forth a fact, equally sad, disgraceful, and undeniable."

"Crime and vice have increased year after year almost *pari passu* with the development of the public school system, which, instead of lifting the masses, has given us in their place a nondescript and hybrid class, unfit for professional or mercantile life, unwilling and also unable to be farmers or artisans, so that gradually our skilled labor is done more by immigrant foreigners, while our native citizens, who would otherwise naturally fill this respectable and comfortable position in society, seek to make their living by their wits, honestly if they can; if not, more or less dishonestly; or failing thus, by petty office-seeking. Filial respect and parental love have both diminished; and as for the modesty of our young men, and even of our young women, they do not even blush that they have lost it. This is the condition in which we are, after more than half a century of experience of our public school system, the only justification for whose existence is that it was asserted and believed to be a panacea for the cure of social and political disease."

And yet this system has a hold on the popular imagination. The cry: "The schools are in danger!" adroitly raised at the proper time is sure to tell. The Republicans, by proposing in 1876 and 1880 to saddle this monstrosity on the people of the United States forever, by a constitutional amendment, made a bid for the weak-minded who could be caught by the cry. But this was not enough.

At the head of the Democratic organization in New York State, stood Tammany Hall, a curious society organization of the last century. Its leading spirit was a Catholic, John Kelly. This prominence of a Catholic gave umbrage to many in the party, and especially in the western part of the State a strong feeling was excited against him, and in favor of any one whom he opposed. In 1879 the Democratic State Convention refused to listen to the protests of Tammany Hall. Republicans saw their opportunity and money was spent and art employed to widen the breach. The result was that John Kelly was nominated for Governor as an independent

Democratic candidate. The nomination of a Catholic for governor of New York under any circumstances was certain to entail defeat. This had been clearly proved in Kernan's case. The mere fact of Kelly's running roused all the bitter anti-Catholic element in the Democratic party, and made its desertion of the party in 1880 almost certain. It gave New York with the whole State machinery into the hands of the Republicans, who had thus made a great stride towards success in the Presidential campaign.

To work this vein more thoroughly they organized the "National School League," to labor in all directions to instil into the minds of the people the idea that the public schools were in danger, and that they could be preserved only by insuring the success of the Republican party. To make this point more palpable to the bigoted, it was necessary to induce the Democrats to put forward some candidate who could be pointed at as a deadly enemy of the public schools, in other words, some Catholic.

This, too, was dexterously done. The first attempt was made through that great enemy of Catholicity, the New York *Herald*, the paper that vilified Archbishop Hughes, and charged Archbishop McCloskey with the whole responsibility for the Orange riots which that paper did so much to provoke. Bennet endeavored to induce the Democratic leaders to nominate for a judicial position a nominal Catholic who would have disgraced them. This failed. Then when the two Democratic organizations agreed to act in harmony, Irving Hall was induced to propose to Tammany a candidate for mayor of New York, Mr. Grace, an Irishman and a Catholic.

The evidence that all this was the result of shrewd political work on the Republican side is very strong. The next day the *Herald* came out with an article denouncing the nomination as an assault on the public school system, and proclaiming that this was a Protestant country, and that we were a Protestant people. It was the keynote, and the Republican press in the afternoon and the next morning caught it up with every exaggeration and perversion calculated to inflame the public mind. Not one had the moral honesty to examine or show how much or how little power the Mayor really possessed in the matter of the schools.

On the next Sunday many Protestant pulpits rang with anti-Catholic appeals. General Grant attended the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, and there the Rev. J. P. Newman urged his congregation to vote against the Democratic candidate for Mayor. He said:

"The whole future of the country is bound up in the public schools. To the public school system the Catholic Church is opposed; they want parochial schools; Cardinal

Antonelli once said that he would prefer to have a child run in the streets than receive the education given by the public schools of Massachusetts.

"Let the history of Europe lift up its warning voice for resolute action to save our public schools from that power which smites and destroys free institutions. All the faculties of man say that no one man shall rule this city. The Catholic candidate for Mayor is the shadow of a man, who is the shadow of another man, who is the shadow of a third man, who is the shadow of a fourth man, and I don't want to vote for a shadow. The issue has come down to that grand institution—our public schools. The crisis is upon us. We are called to meet the question next Tuesday. We must forget for the moment that we are Democrats or Republicans. Do your duty boldly and successfully on next Tuesday."

And he made pretended quotations from Archbishop Kenrick, Father Hecker, and others, which he had more than once used on previous occasions, and which he continues to use unscrupulously, although proof was produced by the late Dr. Charles I. White of their falsity.

"At the Bedford Street M. E. Church, the Rev. George Van Alstyne walked up and down the platform as he declared the nomination of Mr. Grace was an insidious attempt on the part of the Church of Rome to gain possession of this Government, and to annihilate our public schools.

"'Shall we at this late day,' the minister shouted, 'forget the glorious rights secured to us by our forefathers on the bloody battlefields of Lexington and Bunker Hill?'"

"'Here's one that won't,' cried a man in the rear of the church; and there was applause.

"The Rev. W. F. Hatfield, in the Washington Square Methodist Church, said: 'If we consider that Rome is likely to continue to increase her power in the time to come as she has in that which has passed,—if the highest office in this city is likely to be filled by one of her warmest supporters, and if this loyal son bids fair cheerfully to comply with her demands,—then it would be well for voters to decide for whom they shall cast their ballots, so as to preserve our free school system in its purity. The Roman hierarchy should be dealt such a blow at this time that its encroaching power in this city will be destroyed.'

"In the Church of the Holy Trinity, in Madison Avenue and Forty-second Street, the Rev. Dr. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., said that the permanence of a democratic form of government depended upon the maintenance of a free, non-sectarian public school system. The safety of our free institutions he thought was menaced. After an utter silence of forty years a religious body, controlling more than 50,000 voters in this city, had sought again to destroy the integrity of our school system. By appealing to the fears of defeat of one great party, by threatening others with loss of municipal power and patronage, and by the promise of preferment, in case of success, to another class, was this body attempting, in a threefold manner, to succeed in doing what it had before tried in vain to accomplish. This plan, as developed at this time, was not lacking in subtlety or wisdom. Only public sentiment, properly awakened and penetrating to the three classes to whom allusion had been made, could prevent disaster. The Pope, Dr. Tyng said, was now infallible. That was settled; and his encyclical positively asserted that the Romish Church had the right to interfere in the management of the public schools, and that all children must come under the instructions of the Romish Church. Against the claim of the Roman Catholics for a share of the public school money the State could bring a counter claim for the support of thousands of vagrants and criminals educated in parochial schools. The Catholics had always asked for the establishment of a system of education that favored bigotry, if it did not lead to crime, and the success of its plans would be the destruction of free govern-

ment. It was inherently impossible for a Roman Catholic to rest in peace with the tolerance of our public school system still preserved. And if the speaker held to the dogmas of that church, he could never rest either until this great free school system should be destroyed."

On all sides the cry was taken up; sometimes by ignorant fanatics, whom we may charitably suppose to have been, to some extent, in good faith, but in many cases, by men of ordinary intelligence, who could only have been acting a part, unless they were deaf, dumb or blind.

This move won the game. The Republicans, without any danger of a Know-Nothing party being formed at that late day, could count on drawing away from the Democratic ranks enough gulls who would be deluded by their "No Popery" cry. They had virtually gained the day.

Catholics finding that Protestant Democrats deserted the party began to waver and give up. The whole Democratic party became a panic-stricken body. The mere lifting of a "No Popery" bugbear had demoralized the whole host. Tilden in 1876 had carried New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Indiana, but Hancock carried of these only one, New Jersey, and that by a trifling majority, while the Democratic majority in New York was swept away entirely, the State giving Garfield a majority of over twenty thousand.

The evoking of the school question, without the slightest foundation for the wild assertions and charges of the unprincipled men who began denouncing the Catholics as enemies of education, did its work. The American public suffered itself to be bamboozled and fooled most egregiously. Bad as the public school system is, whether as a system of instruction in the rudiments of education, or in the moral training of the children committed to it, Catholics have for years left it to its own fate, to live its life and die its death. Catholics had done nothing against the public schools, had no organization against them. There had not been a Catholic meeting held anywhere on the subject. The whole idea of any Catholic movement against the schools was a preposterous falsehood, knowingly put forward, and backed up by men like Hawkins, who repeated his old lie that the New York Cathedral property was a gift from the city, when it had been in Catholic hands by purchase for the greater part of the present century, by men like the Methodist minister Newman, who repeated falsehoods which had been already exposed.

Thus the whole canvass turned on a side issue, and was decided, not by any preference of the people for the doctrines of the Republican party over those of the Democratic school, but by the adroit management of the former, who led their antagonist to steps which enabled them to excite and profit by the old Know-Nothing spirit,

which prompts, directs, and controls so many people in this country, men who otherwise seem possessed of ordinary common-sense, and not likely to be led by the nose; but who, once the red flag marked "Popery" is waved before their eyes, like the bull in the arena, lose all self-control, and rush at it, regardless of every interest at stake.

The State of New York given to Hancock, would have elected him; given to Garfield, it places him in the Presidential chair. All turned on New York, and mainly on the great cities of New York and Brooklyn. There the Know-Nothing element in the Democratic party went over to the Republicans in such numbers as to give Garfield a majority of twenty thousand in a Democratic State.

The Democratic party is often held up on all sides as the great friend and supporter of the Catholics. There never was a grosser error. Catholics by the thousands have been for years adherents to the doctrines which have been the traditional creed of that party, —a limitation of the powers of the National Government, a tariff for revenue only, sound currency, and the greatest amount of individual and municipal freedom compatible with safe government. But the party has never in any way favored them as Catholics, has never, when their constitutional rights were menaced, held steadfastly to true, sound American principles, and has always opposed the nomination of Catholics for important offices, and deserted them at the ballot-box when actually nominated.

In the first great anti-Catholic movement in this country, the days of Miss Reid, and Maria Monk, when the Church was assailed by obscene and ribald libels, and the home of defenceless women was destroyed by a mob, the Democratic party controlled the country; but the editor who stepped forward to examine like a man the story of Maria Monk, who went to Montreal to visit, book in hand, the places she pretended to describe, and who came back to pour into unwilling ears, the real facts of the imposture and fraud, Colonel William L. Stone, was not the director of a Democratic paper.

New Hampshire stands to this day as the great anti-Catholic State. It was for years strongly Democratic, but the party never moved to enfranchise Catholics, or admit them to a full share of the privileges and rights which their Protestant fellow-citizens enjoyed. On the contrary, the Democratic party and its leaders steadily adhered to the old policy. By the constitution of 1792, provision was made by tax for "the support and maintenance of the public Protestant teachers," and, defining the qualifications of members of the House of Representatives, enacted that they "shall be of the Protestant religion." Strong opposition was made in the

convention to this proscription of Catholics, but when the constitution was submitted to the people, these clauses were sustained, in many towns there being not a single vote against them. And so the constitution went into effect excluding Catholics from the governor's chair, and from both houses of the legislature, and taxing them to support Protestant ministers. That constitution stood for more than half a century without a Democratic effort to remove this bigoted and illiberal element. This constitution, to use the words of a New Hampshire judge, branded the Catholic, "though educated, and talented, and virtuous, with infamy and disgrace, and sent him and his family through our streets and social circles, marked like Cain, as a sort of degraded outcast or helot, not fit to be intrusted with either legislative or executive rights, though bestowed fully on the most ignorant and reprobate."

The Democratic party steadily opposed any alteration of the constitution. At last in 1850 the people of the State resolved to call a convention, and in that body the Democrats, headed by Franklin Pierce, opposed any alteration in the clause providing for the support of the Protestant clergy by general tax. Cass, a Democrat, introduced a clause for the perpetual exclusion of Catholics from office, supported it by a fierce speech denouncing Catholics, and a Democratic paper declared it "the most important amendment proposed." When the constitutional amendments were finally submitted to the people, that which proposed Catholic emancipation was rejected; the Democratic vote for governor was 24,425, but the whole vote for relieving Catholics from the support of a State and for admitting them to office was only 13,575.

In March, 1852, a special amendment, intended to relieve Catholics from exclusion from office, was submitted to the people, and received 9566 votes, though the full Democratic vote was 30,999.

In New York and many other States, that were for years Democratic, exclusion of Catholics from office, if not embodied in the written constitution, is a part of the unwritten one. Never but once have New York Democrats been willing to nominate a Catholic for governor, and at once the anti-Catholic Democrats deserted their party and went over to the Republicans in such numbers, as to defeat Kernan. At the head of the Educational Department in the State government of New York is the Board of Regents of the University. All the Catholic colleges of the State, four in number, and the female academies are directly under the control of this body. That board stands an embodiment of the intense bigotry and intolerance of New York. It has been in existence for nearly a century, yet in all that time, if you scan the long list of Regents, you find Protestants of every denomination, you find almost always, if not always, some Protestant denomina-

tion represented there by one of its clergy, but from one end of the list to the other you cannot find a single Catholic name. Yet there never has been a time when there were not Catholic gentlemen in the State who were the peers, if not the superiors of many in that board. Dr. Macneven, Thomas C. Levins, Charles O'Connor, Francis Kernan, Oliver Byrne, Dr. Emmet, Levi S. Ives, Henry J. Anderson, Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan, historian of the State (to name but a few eminent in special branches), could but have given dignity to the board. Yet no Catholic has ever been appointed, and no Democratic governor has ever risen high enough above this miserable spirit of bigotry even to nominate a Catholic. The general school-law would leave the election of the school officers and of the board in New York city in the hands of the people. To defeat this a law was framed especially, and the appointment of the commissioners constituting the Board of Education was vested in the mayor. William F. Havemeyer, an old Democrat, was elected mainly by Democratic votes, and he made the appointments, selecting one single Catholic from a Catholic population of nearly half a million, while from the Presbyterian denomination, who never had a free school of their own, who, as a denomination, had never done anything for the education of the poor, this model Democrat selected eleven commissioners, although even the census of 1880 fails to show us eleven Presbyterians in New York to one Catholic.

Know-Nothingism is generally rampant in Democratic States. The Native Americans elected James Harper, one of the publishers of *Maria Monk*, mayor of New York city, mainly by the votes of Democrats. Maryland and Louisiana are Democratic States, and nowhere is anti-Catholic fanaticism more intense, while Louisville in Democratic Kentucky will long remember its day of blood.

The Democratic party has never set itself firmly against bigotry and intolerance. It willingly accepts Catholic votes, we admit, and will occasionally give an inferior office to a Catholic, or permit one to be elected in a district where Catholic votes so preponderate that they are essential to elect the rest of the ticket.

Catholic votes have indeed formed a notable part of the strength of the Democratic party; but they gave it their support only as being on the whole less radical and intolerant than the Republican party. Only on this ground have intelligent Catholics ever advocated adherence to it. And they did it conscious that the anti-Catholic element in the party would at any moment insure the defeat of the regular candidate, rather than raise a Catholic to office.

It is somewhat strange too that while some politicians never lay aside their anti-Catholic feelings, but will work against Catholics

in the party and insure their defeat, as in the cases of Judge Campbell in Pennsylvania, Kernan in New York, Judge Tenney in New Jersey, and others elsewhere, and will even go so far as to leave the party and work against it when any distinct anti-Catholic movement is made, yet Catholics seem to preserve and harbor no feelings against them.

Men prominent in Know-Nothing movements have been subsequently put forward as Democratic candidates and elected mainly by Catholic votes, that is to say, they would have been defeated in every case had Catholics resented their bigotry and refused to support them.

Catholics as Catholics have never put forward any claim to political recognition, but if they are the only voters who adhere persistently to the Democratic party, who are not driven from it by hostility to themselves, sacrificing rather their private feelings to the general good, it would surely seem that the fact ought to be definitely understood and recognized. They certainly should have a greater share in shaping the policy of the party than those who desert it at every cry raised by the enemy. Nor should Catholics continue to uphold a party which rewards those who insult and injure the most steadfast adherents of its platform.

The old anti-Catholic feeling is not dead, and will be brought up again and again. Its history in this country is one of violence, forgery, fraud, and misrepresentation. But there are dupes by the thousand who swallow without examination any charge against us, and will act in the gravest matters under the impulse of the false ideas with which they are imbued.

It is a sad thing to see falsehood, vituperation and slander so unblushingly used, and used so effectively. And it is no less strange than sad to have to record the fact in the United States, in the boasted light and intelligence of the nineteenth century, the election of President of the country can be controlled by a few lies against Catholics dexterously put and shamelessly reiterated. Yet such is really the fact. "'Tis true, and pity 'tis 'tis true." The Catholics of the United States labor under no delusions. They know that the public opinion of the country is overwhelmingly against them, and that it can on an instant be arrayed in either party against them by any fanatic or by any schemer who dons cap and bells of a fanatic for his own ends. Finding that the public schools were to the highest degree Protestant and proselytizing; that they were part and parcel of the Protestant religion, as completely as the Protestant churches, there was no alternative for us Catholics except to build our own schools and instruct our own children as best we might. As Americans we must deplore this, and the time will come when statesmen will look back with

wonder and regret at the folly which taxed a whole community for schools, and then drove a large element out of them, merely to gratify a handful of fanatics, by making the schools an instrument for proselytizing, for insulting and annoying any part of the people.

We can do nothing ; and any attempt to do anything only strengthens the present system. It is on trial, and disaffection has already begun. Richard Grant White's will not be the only attempt to show the weakness and shallowness of the present system of public schools. From another direction comes the effort to make the school system lift the mask, and to compel it not only to talk of secularism, but to practice it. Now it claims to be non-sectarian and is intensely Protestant. The Protestant religion is a term that has been used in law-books for centuries ; what it is definitely is not so easily stated. It need not believe in a personal God, for many persons do not ; it need not believe in the Trinity, for Unitarians do not, yet are Protestant ; it need not believe in the Divinity or Humanity of our Lord ; it need not believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, for Bishop Colenso and the recent Dutch Protestant commentators on the Bible do not ; it need not believe in the fall of man, redemption, or eternal punishment, for Protestants daily disclaim them as articles of faith ; it need not believe that man's soul is immortal, for a Baptist clergyman has recently been denying it, unchecked and uncensured. One, and only one point, it must unhesitatingly believe, and that is that the Catholic Church and its whole system is and has for centuries been wrong. This is apparently all of Protestantism that the secularists intend to leave in the schools. Every element of Christianity will be eliminated from them.

Every denomination in which any real religious spirit remains will form its own schools, as the only means of keeping Christianity alive in the hearts of the young. The Episcopal body has already moved, feeling that some step was necessary. They have been violently assailed, but they are too conservative a body to be easily deterred from their course. Their example will be followed. Every religious body that believes in God and in redemption through Christ must establish its own schools to save the coming generations, for in a few years the public schools will be as hostile to Christianity as they are now to Catholicity.

In any coming discussion as to the schools, we Catholics may prudently abstain from any part. We are taxed for them, and must submit to that wrong. We shall ere long have plenty of companions smarting under the sense of wrong as bitterly as we do.

To remedy the injustice seems now impossible ; we should merely arouse an unreasoning and unconvincible hate. Provi-

dence will direct all wisely, and guide all for its own purposes, while we are making sacrifice on sacrifice, to do for our children what we feel to be highest and most imperative duty. We must train our children as Catholics, knowing, loving, and practicing their faith, and not to be lured or driven from it.

In the politics of the country our course is plain. Our association should be guided by our conscientious advocacy of all measures tending to its greatest good, the benefit of the whole country, and the greatest amount of personal and local liberty consistent with good government. As new parties arise, each one of us entitled to the elective franchise will exercise it conscientiously, giving his preference for the honest and upright men who will, as far as human judgment can determine, advocate the soundest principles.

A new party may arise embodying so many sound principles, and opposed to all fanaticism, and to all domination in the State or its schools of any combination of sects; such a party Catholics may heartily and conscientiously support.

IRELAND'S GREAT GRIEVANCE.

LAND TENURE IN IRELAND AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

"The law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this, and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original."—BLACKSTONE, *Nature of Laws in General*.

AVOIDING a discussion of the political situation in Ireland, the reader's attention is invited to an economic and industrial question of importance to the civilized world.

Perhaps the feeling of security will be greater if we approach it over English roads.

The heads of the inquiry are these :

I. Actual condition of Ireland.

II. The cause which has produced this condition.

III. Different operation of the same land laws in England and Ireland.

IV. Peasant proprietary in other countries.

V. English testimony on the Irish land tenure.

VI. Efforts to ameliorate it.

VII. The interest of the United States in the correct and permanent settlement of the question.

With one or two exceptions, which will be found properly noted, the authorities used in the preparation of this article are not Irish. They are almost all English.

I.

ACTUAL CONDITION OF IRELAND.

Ireland has an area of about twenty million acres. It is about three-fifths the size of Illinois or Iowa, a little more than one-third the size of Oregon, not one-third as large as Colorado. It would not cover one-fifth of California. Its population is five millions and a half. But they have not twenty million acres to live upon. Six million acres are waste land. Five million and a half of people must live, therefore, on fourteen million acres. They have nothing to live by but the soil.

Why is Ireland without commerce and manufactures? Why is her entire population dependent on a single means of support? Does not the sea beat everywhere upon her shores? Why has she no trade with the world? Has she not magnificent harbors? Where are her ships? Has she not broad rivers, lakes, canals?

Are there not in her bosom fine clays, stones, coal and peat, iron, copper, and lead? Why has she no manufactures?

Because England destroyed them as rapidly as they gave evidence of life. They were annihilated by "the almost incredible selfishness and insolence of British commercial legislation."¹ "It must be difficult for any Englishmen, without deep shame, or for any Irishman, without bitter indignation, to read the story of Ireland's wrongs as told by Lord Dufferin."²

This gentleman has been so often and so highly honored by the British Government that his account of the commercial laws by which all manufacturing industries were rendered practically impossible in Ireland will not be disputed. But, in accordance with the assurance already given, I prefer to take that story from an Englishman. The authority is no less eminent than Richard Cobden. "The first restrictions," he says, "put upon the Irish trade were in the reign of Charles II.; and from that time down to the era when the United Volunteers of Ireland stepped forward to rescue their country from its oppressors (the only incident, by the way, deserving the name of a really national effort) our policy was directed incessantly to the destruction of the foreign trade of that country. Every attempt at manufacturing industry, with one exception, was likewise mercilessly nipped in the bud. Her natural capabilities might, for example, have led the people to the making of glass; it was enacted that no glass should be allowed to be exported from Ireland, and its importation, except from England, was also prohibited. Her soil, calculated for the pasturing of sheep, would have yielded wool equal to the best English qualities; an absolute prohibition was laid on its exportation, and King William, addressing the British Parliament, declared that he 'would do everything in his power to discourage the woollen manufacture of Ireland.' Down to the year 1779 we find that the export of woollen goods from that island remained wholly interdicted. Not only was her commerce with the different ports of Europe fettered by the imposition of restrictions upon every valuable product that could interfere with the prosperity of England; not only was all trade with Asia and the East of Europe excluded by the charters which were granted to the companies of London; but her ports were actually sealed against the trade of the American Colonies. Although Ireland presented to the ships of North America the nearest and the noblest havens in Europe, and appeared to be the natural landing-place for the products of the New World, her peo-

¹ A Plea for Peasant Proprietors. With the Outline of a Plan for their Establishment in Ireland. By William Thomas Thornton, C.B., author of a Treatise on Labor, etc. London: Macmillan & Co. 1874. P. 199.

² Ibid.

ple were deprived of all benefit—nay, they were actually made to suffer loss and inconvenience from their favored position; laws were passed prohibiting the importation of American commodities into Ireland, without first landing them in some port of England or Wales, whilst the export of Irish products to the Colonies, excepting through some British port, was interdicted. If we add to this that a law was enacted preventing beef or live cattle from being exported to England, some idea may be formed of the commercial policy of this country towards Ireland—a policy savoring more of the mean and sordid tyranny of the individual huckster over his poorer rival than of any nobler oppression that is wont to characterize the acts of victorious nations. Need we wonder that at this moment the commerce of Ireland does not much exceed the trade of one second rate port in Scotland?"

Well might the lover of humanity wish that there was nothing to be added to this appalling record, as disgraceful to England as it has been ruinous to Ireland. But it is unfortunately true that in spite of his manly frankness Mr. Cobden does not mention all the laws which English tyranny enacted for the suppression of Irish trade.

When the exportation of live cattle from Ireland into England was forbidden by Elizabeth, to please the English cattle-raisers, the Irish graziers attempted to repair their fortunes by killing the cattle and exporting the cured meats. A prohibitory duty was laid on these and the spasm of new activity ceased. The hides of the animals were tanned and the leather was sent across to English buyers. As soon as that was detected it was forbidden. Sheep-farming was the next experiment. As Mr. Cobden states, that was prohibited by Charles II.; but he is incorrect in describing the law against the exportation of wool as the first restriction on Irish trade. The effect of the legislation of the reign of William against Irish industry drove twenty thousand of the woollen workers out of Ireland, most of them coming to the United States. Some ambition remained among the Irish manufacturers, who then tried the silk business, but the English producer cried out again and the Irish silk industry was immediately forbidden. Cotton manufacturing, sugar refining, soap and candle making were in turn prohibited; and the market of England being sealed against the enterprise of the Irish exporter, it remained for him to try the more remote markets of the world. The sea was Ireland's and the sea should give her a foreign trade, since domestic she could have none. But the English manufacturers still watched her awaking thrift. The sea was not hers. Her scores of harbors were ordered shut. The

¹ The Political Writings of Richard Cobden, vol. i, p. 54.

flag of Ireland was forbidden the ocean highways. For two hundred years this merciless course was persistently followed. Ireland has no manufactures, because it was inconsistent with the interest of her government that she should have any. She has no commerce, because her government destroyed it. The information will come, perhaps, with a shock to many Americans whose reading has not taken this unwonted direction.

In all history, ancient or modern, England, in her relations with Ireland, is the only government which destroyed the trade and commerce of a large portion of her subjects for the advantage of another portion. England is the only government, ancient or modern, that systematically kept in pauperism millions of her own people in spite of their persistent efforts to escape from it. The destruction of her manufactures and the annihilation of her trade compelled Ireland to become and to remain an agricultural country. If being only that is the cause of all her subsequent misfortunes,—as so many are ready to affirm,—at least let Americans be just in placing the responsibility where alone it belongs.

"Debarred from every other industry," says Lord Dufferin, "the entire nation flung itself back on the land with as fatal an impulse as when a river, whose current is suddenly impeded, rolls back and drowns the valley it once fertilized."

A people who depend on agriculture alone are necessarily poor. Then it is not Ireland's fault that she is poor. A people who live by agriculture alone are necessarily idle. It is not the fault of Ireland that she is idle. "Ireland is idle," says John Bright, "therefore she starves; Ireland starves and therefore she rebels." It is not her fault that Ireland starves; is it strange that she should rebel? "It is for the most part a forced idleness," adds Mr. Bright, "for it is notorious that when the Irish come to England or remove to the United States or the colonies, they are about the hardest-working people in the world."¹

Having been reduced by legislation, in which they had no voice, to a purely agricultural class, what is the condition in which we find them to-day?

Five millions and a half exist on fourteen million acres of land. Yet they have no land! They are mere tenants, liable to be driven off the little farms they occupy whenever it pleases the landlord. When they are driven off what becomes of them? There are no immense manufacturing towns as in England for them to find employment in. There are no mines in which to bury themselves and their children. If they have money enough to pay for transportation they quit the country. The instances in which they

¹ Speeches of John Bright. London: Macmillan & Co. 2 vols. Vol. i., p. 307.

have enough money for that are very rare. "Where this is not the case," says Professor Cairnes, "they will cower, often for days and weeks together, in ditches by the roadside, dependent for their support on casual charity."¹

What is the actual condition of those who are suffered to keep their holdings? They live in a state of abject poverty. Its depth is infallibly indicated in their food and their shelter and their clothing.

What is their food? The potato. If that crop fails, there is famine.

What is their clothing? The rudest and most meagre covering of nakedness.

What is their shelter? Mud-cabins, without the simplest conveniences of civilization.

The census commissioners divided the dwellings into four classes. The first are comfortable and substantial. The second are houses of from five to nine rooms, on the farm, or in the town. The third and fourth are of mud. The fourth are of one room only. According to the census returns of 1871 there were 512,801 dwellings of the third and fourth classes. Estimating five persons to a dwelling, which is probably below the fact in Ireland, there were two million and a half persons living in mud-houses, and more than half of them in mud-cabins of one room. The distress of the last year, on account of which so many have been unable to pay their rent, has undoubtedly increased the number of persons in the fourth-class dwellings. It is probably true that three-fourths of the people of Ireland are to-day in mud-houses. The American houses are the most convenient and comfortable in the world. It will be difficult for their occupants to realize what living in a mud-cabin means; and that difficulty can scarcely be lessened by the reflection that so long as the present system of land tenure is the law in Ireland, the mud-cabin remains the only shelter for the poor tenant.

Such is the physical condition of the Irish people. What is their intellectual state? One-third of the entire population can neither read nor write.

In 1845 the population of Ireland was nearly nine millions. In 1881 it is five millions and a half. What has become of the people? The famine of 1846-47 carried many into the kindly grave. In less than thirty years three millions of the Irish people have been compelled to leave their native country in search of the means of living. For treasure they carried away a singularly pure domestic nature, an affectionate and even sunny disposition, and hearts full of gratitude and friendship to the generous nation whose hospitality they have received.

Their visible outfit was tied up in a handkerchief.

But their government sent with them a large luggage. Their poverty and their ignorance were not the greatest part of it. "Driven forth by poverty, Irishmen emigrate in great numbers," says John Bright, "and in whatever quarter of the world an Irishman sets his foot, there stands a bitter, an implacable enemy of England."¹ "Men," says Professor Cairnes, "leaving their country full of such bitter recollections would naturally not be forward to disseminate the most amiable idea respecting Irish landlordism and the power which upholds it. I own I cannot wonder that a thirst for revenge should spring from such calamities; that hatred, even undying hatred, for what they could not but regard as the cause and symbol of their misfortunes—English rule in Ireland—should possess the sufferers; that it should grow into a passion; into a religion, to be preached with fanatic zeal to their kindred and bequeathed to their posterity—perhaps not the less effectually that it happened to be their only legacy."²

II.

THE CAUSE WHICH HAS PRODUCED THIS CONDITION.

The land tenure of Ireland is the cause which has produced the actual condition of the Irish people,—a condition, the lowest which exists under any civilized government.

The fact is not denied that the whole people are dependent on the soil for existence. Their tenure is fixed by law. The working principle of the law is that every effort which the tenant makes to improve his condition is turned into a legal reason for making his condition worse. Every time he takes a step forward, the law turns him two steps backward.

The landlord rents the land to the tenant. Perhaps there is no cottage or even mud-cabin on it. The landlord will neither build a dwelling, nor loan the tenant the money to build it. The tenant builds some sort of shelter. Is it then the property of the tenant? No; it belongs to the landlord. Perhaps there is not a fence on the land. The tenant builds the fences. Will the landlord not allow him the outlay in a rebate of rent? No; the fences have become the property of the landlord. Perhaps the land is wholly without drainage. The tenant drains it. Surely the landlord will compensate him for his time and labor? No; the drainage now is part of the landlord's estate. Possibly the soil is not in a favorable condition for the crops. The tenant must first nurse it and feed it and coax it. Will he receive no compensation? Under the law he is entitled to none. Says Lord Sherbrooke: "The Irish tenant knows

¹ Speeches, vol. i., p. 314.

Political Essays, p. 198.

perfectly well that he has no claim in equity or otherwise to payment for the cabin he may build, the bog he may drain, or the stones he may roll away."¹ And after he has built the cabin or the cottage, and drained the bogs, and put up the fences, and wheedled or enticed the mountainside into geniality, the landlord may step in and say: "When I rented you this farm it was worth only ten pounds a year. It was not drained. It was not fenced. It needed manure and labor before seeding. There was no dwelling on it. Now all these things are accomplished. Therefore, the farm is worth a higher rent. You must now pay twenty pounds a year."

"But I cannot," pleads the tenant.

"Then quit," says the landlord. "Quit," says the law.

"Will you allow me nothing for the permanent improvements I have made?" begs the tenant.

"Not a farthing," says the landlord. "Not a farthing," says the law.

How long would the American people submit to such a law?

Occasionally there is a landlord who recognizes the right of the tenant to compensation for labor which has permanently raised the value of the land. But every such landlord is better than the law. There are not many of them. Lord Sherbrooke is anxious that the world shall not misjudge the landlords. He is willing that legislation should do something for the tenant; but the landlord must not be misjudged. The landlords must not be required to pay the tenants for improvements. In refusing to do so they acted strictly in accordance with the law.

"If a man," inquires Lord Sherbrooke, "is not safe in directing his course by the law of the land, where is he to look for safety?"

"There are no bounds to the tenant's liabilities," says Mr. Thornton,² "and no security against his ejection."

"If a man," asks Lord Sherbrooke, "is not safe in directing his course by the law of the land, where is he to look for safety?"

It is desirable that Americans should understand precisely what the law is for the tenure of land in Ireland, and here it is stated by a distinguished and experienced gentleman, better known in this country as Mr. Robert Lowe.

The law of land tenure, then, is in brief, this:

The labor of the tenant is perpetually confiscated.

When his industry turns his labor into capital in the form of permanent improvements on his holding, his capital is confiscated. What money capital he uses in improving the holding is confiscated.

¹ Legislation for Ireland. The Nineteenth Century, November, 1880.

² A Plea for Peasant Proprietors, p. 190.

Thrift would inspire him to improve the farm. But the fruits of his thrift would be confiscated.

But the improvement of the holding would give superior crops; he would have more money when the rent was paid. He could send his children to school. No; the improvement of the farm would bring with more absolute certainty an increase in the rent. When the increased rent was paid there would be less money left to send the children to school, or to buy physical necessities.

But the improvement in the condition of the tenant cannot be brought about, insists a political economist, except by the improvement of his farm. That is true everywhere but in Ireland. There the improvement of the farm makes the condition of the tenant worse. His labor is confiscated. His money is confiscated. His thrift is punished. His industry is turned into misfortune. If he improves his farm his rent will be raised, or he will be turned off it without the means of procuring shelter. The rent is kept up to the highest competition rates in all seasons. He cannot, in good season or in bad, save enough to give his children a chance to rise above the squalor in which they are born.

It is the interest of the tenant, therefore, not to be thrifty. It is his interest not to be industrious. It is his interest not to make any effort to better himself. It is his interest to keep his children in squalor. It is his interest to be as wretched as possible.

A law which makes these things the interest of human beings is a law against nature. Blackstone, a most fervent Englishman, who glories, pardonably, in her laws and the greatness which they have produced, and which in turn has produced them, says that laws against nature have no validity. Froude, an Englishman who loves his own land as intensely as he hates its victim-sister, says: "Land is not and cannot be property in the sense in which movable things are property. Every human being born into this planet must live upon the land if he lives at all. The land in any country is really the property of the nation which occupies it,"¹—which is true in every country but Ireland.

It is the land system which makes Ireland poor. It is the land system which makes her ignorant. It is the land system which keeps her thriftless. It is the land system which makes her lawless. There is no misfortune, since the last blow at her manufactures, for which the land system is not to blame. Until it is radically changed Ireland must remain poor, ignorant, thriftless, and lawless. In her poverty, her ignorance, her thriftlessness and her lawlessness the whole civilized world shares. The chief sufferer is the United States.

¹ The Nineteenth Century, September, 1880.

The two countries that next to Ireland are most concerned in a correct adjustment of the relations of landlord and tenant there are England and the United States.

III.

DIFFERENT OPERATION OF THE SAME LAND LAWS IN IRELAND AND ENGLAND.

There is slight difference in the land laws of England and Ireland, and that difference, strange to say, is in favor of Ireland. England has never had the advantages of the Encumbered Estates Court nor of its twin tribunal, the Landed Estates Court. We shall reach these very soon. But how vastly in favor of the English tenant is the operation of the land laws! In England the landlord makes all the improvements. The tenant, generally speaking, has fixity of tenure so long, at least, as he pays his rent. Not being compelled to make the improvements, or being equitably compensated for such as he does make which increase the permanent value of the farm, his labor is rewarded, and he is able to save money. If the lord should be pleased to turn his farm into park or put it to manufacturing purposes, the departing tenant cannot complain for the same reason that exists to the ruin of his Irish brother. His labor has not been confiscated. His capital has not been stolen. His industry has not been punished. His thrift has not been turned into calamity. In his interesting, if not profound, *England, her People, Polity, and Pursuits*, Mr. T. H. S. Escott gives an imposing picture of the "Great Landlords and Estate Management." It is altogether too flattering toward them, for the English tenant farmer has something to say to his countrymen when he shall have obtained adequate representation in Parliament. But it is at least true that the land laws are as leniently administered in England as such laws are likely ever to be. The Duke of Devonshire, for instance, makes all the improvements on the farms he rents. Agreements are annual between the duke and his tenants, but there is a revaluation only every twenty-one years. "This arrangement," says Mr. Escott, "comes to very much the same thing as a lease for that term. The tenants know very well that so long as they do their duty by the land they will not receive notice to quit; and here, as elsewhere, the archives of the estate show many cases in which farms have been in possession of the same families, from father to son, for many generations, and not unfrequently for two or three centuries."¹ "There are estates" in Ireland "where a notice to quit," says Mr. Samuelson, "is printed on the back of each half-year's receipt for

¹ England, p. 38.

rent, so that the tenants are under perpetual notice.” “When the revaluation is made,” Mr. Escott goes on, “a full report of the condition of all the farms and other portions of the property is drawn up. Anything that can throw light on the management of a particular holding, and the qualities displayed by a particular tenant, are duly noted down, as also are the improvements which it may be considered desirable to institute, or which the tenant himself may have suggested as necessary. It is then for the duke and his agents to consider whether the property shall remain in the same hands and what repairs shall be effected. In consideration of such repairs as may finally be carried out, either a permanent addition is made to the rent, or else the tenant is charged a percentage on the money expended.” “Improvements in the way of drainage,” Mr. Escott says, describing the tenancies of Westminster, Northumberland, Cleveland, and Devonshire estates, “improvements in the way of drainage, buildings, roads, and fences, are either done at the expense of the landlord, or if the tenant immediately defrays their cost he receives compensation from the landlord.” Mr. Samuelson says of the Irish tenant, that except on the estates of some large proprietors the tenants have made every improvement. They “have erected the house and steadings, have built every fence, have drained the farm more or less perfectly, in many cases have reclaimed it from the mountain or bog.” Yet the rule is that the landlord allows the tenant nothing for all this even on eviction. “As far as the law is concerned” it is “entirely at the option of the landlord” to “make an allowance to the tenant for any or all these improvements, or let him dispose of them to his successor, or whether he will confiscate them as his own property.”

The Gladstone Act of 1870 provided a legal way by which the tenant might obtain in the courts compensation for improvements when evicted for any cause except non-payment of rent. But what proportion of the tenants have the means to go into the courts? And when the failure of crop, on account of bad weather, reduces the peasant farmer to poverty, and he is unable either to get food for his children or money to pay his rent, such a law is of small comfort to him. He is entitled to compensation for the improvements whether he is evicted for one cause or for another. Perhaps, while the law remains as it is now, it would be unreasonable to require the landlord to pay the evicted tenant more than the difference between the arrears of rent and the value of the improvements. Thanks to the law itself, the out-going tenant would not often have much to get.

It would be easy to multiply authorities on the different opera-

¹ Studies of the Land and Tenantry of Ireland, by B. Samuelson, M.P., p. 13.

² England, p. 40.

tion of the laws regulating land in the two countries, but these two Englishmen have stated it with sufficient distinctness. In England there is practically security of tenure. In Ireland there is practically perpetual notice to quit. In England the tenant receives compensation for improvements or the landlord makes them at his own expense. In Ireland the tenant makes all the improvements and the landlord confiscates them. In England the rent is not raised, generally speaking, except every twenty-one years, and then after a fair revaluation. In Ireland, generally speaking, the rent is raised whenever the landlord's agent thinks he can extort another pound out of the tenant. In England capital is permanently united with the land. In Ireland capital is permanently divorced from the land. In England if the tenant must give up his holding, there are all the vast industries of his country for him to seek employment in. In Ireland there is only one industry, the land. The tenant turned out of his holding, moneyless, without skill for any other calling, can find no other employment. He must starve, or commit crime and go to jail, or emigrate.

IV.

PEASANT PROPRIETARY IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

By peasant proprietor is commonly meant a farmer who owns the land he tills.

"Since the French Revolution," writes Mr. W. E. Baxter, "the feudal laws in France, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Germany, North Italy, and Austria have been abolished. . . . The result of this change in all these countries have been, in many instances, the breaking up of the large, unwieldy, unmanageable estates, and the formation of a numerous and powerful conservative class of small proprietors. . . . The change has been highly beneficial wherever it has been brought about—peasants formerly in as miserable a condition as the Irish being now contented and prosperous owners of the soil."¹ "It would be difficult, perhaps," says Professor Cairnes, "to conceive two modes of existence more utterly opposed than the thriftless, squalid, and half-starved life of the peasant of Munster and Connaught and that of the frugal, thriving, and energetic races that have, over a great portion of continental Europe—in Norway, in Belgium, in Switzerland, in Lombardy—and under the most various external conditions, turned swamps and deserts into gardens."²

¹ *Our Land Laws of the Past*. By the Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P. London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. Page 17. Mr. Baxter's brochure is an argument for reform of the land laws of England, especially in relation to primogeniture and entail.

² *Essays*, p. 160.

Let us look first at that "transition between land and sea," that "measureless raft of mud and sand," and discover the miracle of peasant proprietary in the spot where it is most marvellous. In his charming book on Holland, Edmondo de Amicis tells the whole story: what it was in the beginning; what it is now. "There were vast tempestuous lakes like seas touching one another; morass beside morass; one tract covered with brushwood after another; immense forests of pines, oaks, and elders, traversed by hordes of wild horses; and so thick were these forests that tradition says one could travel leagues from tree to tree without ever putting foot to the ground. The deep bays and gulfs carried into the heart of the country the fury of the northern tempests. Some provinces disappeared once every year under the waters of the sea and were nothing but muddy tracts, neither land nor water, where it was impossible either to walk or to sail. The large rivers, without sufficient inclination to descend to the sea, wandered here and there uncertain of their way, and slept in monstrous pools and ponds among the sands of the coasts. It was a sinister place, swept by furious winds, beaten by obstinate rains, veiled in a perpetual fog, where nothing was heard but the roar of the sea and the voices of wild beasts and birds of the ocean."

And what is the Holland of to-day?

Groningen was the province most difficult to transform, and even in the sixteenth century a great part of it was still uninhabited. De Amicis confirms all that Delaveleye, that capable student of peasant proprietary, has written of it and its towns and people. "Groningen, in fact, is like a species of republic governed by a class of educated peasants; a new and virgin country where no patrician castle rears its head above the roof of the tillers of the soil; a province where the products of the land remain in the hands of the cultivators, where wealth and labor always go hand in hand, and idleness and opulence are forever divided." And to what is this almost ideal state to be attributed? "The description would not be complete if I omitted to speak of a certain right peculiar to the Groningen peasantry and called *beklem-regt*, which is considered as the principal cause of the extraordinary prosperity of the province. The *beklem-regt* is the right to occupy a farm with the payment of an annual rent, which the proprietor can never augment. The right passes to the heirs collateral as well as direct, and the holder may transmit it by will, may sell it, rent it, raise a mortgage upon it even, without the consent of the proprietor of the land. Every time, however, that this right passes from one hand to another, whether by inheritance or sale, the proprietor receives one or two years' rent. The farm buildings belong in general to the possessor of the *beklem-regt*, who, when his right is in

any way annulled, may exact the price of the materials. The possessor of the *beklem-regt* pays all taxes, cannot change the form of the property, nor in any way diminish its value. The *beklem-regt* is indivisible. One person only can possess it, and consequently only one of the heirs can inherit it. However, by paying the sum stipulated in case of the passage of the *beklem-regt* from one hand to another, the husband may inscribe his wife or the wife her husband, and then the consort inherits a part of the right. When the possessor is ruined or does not pay his annual rent, the *bekiem-regt* is not at once annulled. The creditors can cause it to be sold, but the purchaser must first of all pay all outstanding debts to the proprietor." It is unnecessary for the traveller to add that thus the farmers have a continuous and strong interest in their improving land, "secure as they are of the sole enjoyment of all the ameliorations which they may introduce into the cultivation; of not having, like ordinary tenants, to pay a rent which grows higher and higher in proportion as they succeed in increasing the fertility of the land. They undertake the boldest enterprises, introduce innovations and carry out the costliest experiments. The legitimate recompense of their labor is the entire and certain profit that accrues from that labor." And these peasants "practice agriculture not blindly, and as if it were to be contemned, but as a noble occupation, which demands the exercise of the noblest faculties of intelligence, and procures for those that follow it fortune, social importance, and public respect."¹

The working of peasant proprietary in France is most strikingly illustrated by the relation of the agricultural class to the public debt of that country. In 1798 the number of holders of *rente* was 24,791. In 1860 this number had increased to 1,073,381. In 1876 it had risen to 3,473,475. In 1879 it reached 4,380,933. The annual interest which these holders of the national obligation draw on their investment is 748,404,971 francs. "It will be seen that the national debt in recent years has been steadily undergoing the process of complete subdivision among the population of France, *the number of public fundholders having come to approach that of the freeholders of the soil.*"² More than half the people of France live by agriculture. Over five millions of the farms are under six acres. There are only five hundred thousand farms averaging sixty acres, and fifty thousand averaging six hundred acres. "The contrast between the land system of France and England," Mr. Cliff Leslie may well assert, "two neighboring countries at the head of civilization, may, without exaggeration, be called the most extraordi-

¹ Holland and Its People. By Edmondo de Amicis. Pages 382 et seq.

² Statesman's Yearbook, 1880, p. 66.

nary spectacle which European society offers for study to political and social philosophy."¹ "Of the soil of England we may say that nobody knows who own it,"² but the nominal owners do not exceed thirty thousand persons. Like so many more Englishmen who abhor confiscation when the results are not to their liking, Mr. Leslie finds satisfaction in affirming that, contrary to prevalent belief, peasant proprietary in France did not originate in the confiscation of the French Revolution. That a large proportion of the small farms did, however, get into the hands of working proprietors through those confiscations is undeniable. Confiscation in France was done in behalf of tenants. Confiscation in Ireland by England was done in behalf of landlords. The contrast is again an "extraordinary spectacle." England is the only government which in modern times, after the decay of feudalism, confiscated land for landlords. Confiscation has taken place in other countries, but it has generally been for tenants. In the sixteenth century Mr. Leslie finds peasants buying small farms in France. It was not the lack of landed property, he goes on to say, which, two hundred years later, left the peasantry in destitution "and drove them to furious vengeance." What was it then? "The deprivation of its use by atrocious misgovernment and the confiscation of its fruits by merciless taxation and feudal oppression." The verdict of the world on the French Revolution does not lack a sense of horror; but if there be any of its consequences which humanity instinctively and unqualifiedly approves it is the wresting of the land by the people and its distribution among the people. Mr. Leslie describes the cause of the insurrection of the peasantry correctly. They had land, indeed; but it did not keep them from destitution while their noble masters dazzled Europe with their splendid luxury. The peasantry were deprived of the benefits of the land by "atrocious misgovernment." They, too, suffered confiscation of the fruits alike of the land and their labor. They finally arose and wreaked a "furious vengeance;" and to-day they present to the world an example of thrift, industry, patriotism, and contentment which the appreciative pen of this broad-minded Englishman effectively presents. Is he willing to concede that the historian of the next century shall tell in the same spirit the fate of the Irish peasant? Let us hope that there will be no "furious vengeance" to describe; but that the wrongs of the peasant, wrongs which in France were wiped out by revolution, shall be righted in a peaceful and legal way.

"The subdivision of the French soil," says Mr. Leslie, "which

¹ Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries, p. 336. (Cobden Club Essays.)

² The Land Question, with Particular Reference to England and Scotland, by John Macdonnell (London, Macmillan & Co.), p. 24.

has been the subject of sincere regret and pity on the part of many eminent English writers and speakers, as well as of much ignorant contempt on the part of prejudiced politicians, is really both a cause and an effect of the increased wealth of every part of the population, the seller and buyer of land, the landowner, the farmer and laborer, the country and the town." But all the people in France who live by agriculture are not landowners. There are tenant farmers there. What are the relations between them and the landlords? Mr. Leslie answers fully and briefly. There are two kinds of tenure: by lease for a money rent and by *métayage*, according to which the proprietor and the tenant work the farm in partnership, each furnishing a proportion of the capital and dividing the produce. The contract for *métayage* is really a lease, and usually extends over a term of years. "The truth is," writes Mr. Leslie, "the system of short tenures common throughout most of Western Europe has a common barbarous origin. It belongs to a state of agriculture which took no thought of a distant future and involved no lengthened outlay, and which gave the land frequent rest in fallow; and it belongs to a state of commerce in which sales of land were rare, changes of proprietorship equally so, and ideas of making the most of landed property commercially non-existent. It is right to observe, however, that in many parts of France, although the stated period of tenure is commonly short, the farm really remains commonly with the same family from father to son, from generation to generation, provided only the rent is paid." The tenant is never in apprehension of eviction. On the contrary, so fortunate is he in the fruits of his toil that he does not like to incumber himself with a long lease because he intends to buy land and become himself a proprietor. "Again, although no legal customs of tenure for unexhausted improvements remain in France, where the *Côte* has swept away all customary laws, yet compensation for some unexhausted improvements exists under the *Côte*. . . . It is fortunate for France not only that peasant proprietorship already exists on a great scale, but that the tendency of the economic progress of the country, as already shown, is to substitute more and more cultivation by peasant proprietors for cultivation by tenants; and to give more and more to those who remain tenants or laborers the position and sentiments of proprietors." Why would not this be fortunate for Ireland and England? "France," says Mr. Leslie, in conclusion, "has had only three-quarters of a century of anything like liberty and less than half a century of tranquillity and industrial life." He wrote just on the eve of the Franco-Prussian War. Yet he deems the French land system not only "the salvation of the country itself, but one of the

principal securities for the tranquillity and economic progress of Europe."

The results of the brief and disastrous conflict into which the country was plunged by the ambition and folly of the last of the emperors furnishes a remarkable emphasis for this conclusion. It was her peasant proprietors and tenant farmers who subscribed with such cheerful alacrity so great a proportion of the immense forfeit France had to pay for the fatal imperial venture. It is they who constitute to-day the conservatism and strength of the republic. It is her free land that makes and will keep France free; and it is the well-recompensed, the industrious, and the thrifty tillers of the soil that will hold back the politicians at the head of the government from rushing into foreign wars or precipitating either monarchy or anarchy at home. France is stable because her land belongs to those who live by it. For that reason is she rich. For that reason is she prosperous. For that reason is she contented. For that reason is she to-day one of the preservers of the peace of Europe, and the most efficient promoter of all industries, all arts, fine and industrial, and all economic progress.

Let us go to Prussia. "A people," says John Macdonnell, "are what their land system makes them; the soil that they till is stronger than they; and the essence of their history records the changes in the ownership of their land. Frugal and industrious or unfixed and unstable in their ways, they are according to the nature of their tenure of land. . . . Disappointingly feeble as is most political machinery to alter men for better or for worse, . . . a statesman has one instrument which pierces through all obstacles and uses men as clay. That instrument is legislation affecting land. A Stein or a Hardenberg who knows how to use it may shape the morals and destiny of a people."¹

Napoleon destroyed the German Empire in 1803. The edict of emancipation in 1807 laid anew its permanent foundations. That edict freed the peasant and the land. Two years later the superstructure was begun. The law of 1811 made the peasant a proprietor. Then the empire became invincible. The German armies that Napoleon put to rout were serfs who had nothing to fight for but their serfdom. The soldier of the new German empire is a freeman who had his land and his home and his family to fight for.

To whom the credit of the creation of peasant proprietary in Prussia belongs, is not historically clear. It should be divided among the king and the ministers by whom he was surrounded at that period. None of them seemed to comprehend fully the

¹ The Land Question, pp. 4-5.

scope or the consequences of the momentous step. Even Stein wrote that it was reserved for Hardenberg to take the advice of a dreamer who died in a madhouse, and transform the peasants into landlords;¹ but Stein himself procured the signature of the king to the edict and promulgated it. The law of 1811, by which the peasant was made the actual proprietor, and the landlord was indemnified by the state for his loss, was Hardenberg's. But when its operation became clear to Stein he not only adopted it but provided for its universal application; and when, after the preliminaries were completed, the law received the royal assent, well might a commentator of the time² declare that there had come "the dawn of a golden day upon economic darkness, and a new creation rising out of the ruins of destructive war; never had any public measure been taken which had more happily or more beneficially united the private happiness of many families with the interest of the state."

To-day half the people of Prussia are engaged in agriculture under conditions which insure the permanence of the state more effectually than all the enactments of Bismarck. The first Napoleon easily threw serfs into consternation. The last Napoleon found a phalanx of free farmer soldiers a wall which he could not shatter, and whose stones flew upon him for his destruction. The French army which the last Napoleon hastily precipitated into a war which the French nation did not solicit, was chiefly composed of the undisciplined crowds of the cities. The huge German army was drawn chiefly from the bone and muscle of the German land. The men had their farms and their homes to return to when the conflict was over. They had not sought the war either; but since it was thrust upon them, they fought like men who wanted it quickly ended so that they might return to their homes and their fields. The statement that the hurriedly augmented French army, whose valor was so superior to their discipline and their generalship, was largely a collection of city multitudes, is amply warranted by the time in which it was gotten together, and the statistics showing the transformation of the rural into an urban population in the ten preceding years. Their valor could have been no greater had every man been a veteran; but they fought with dash, not with discipline; with the enthusiasm of national glory, not with the steadiness and endurance of those who have homes and farms awaiting them, and whose commanders knew the art of war as well as they the art of husbandry. In the American rebellion whole regiments, composed, probably, of men who had never smelled gunpowder, fought with

¹ The Life and Times of Stein; or, Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic age. By J. R. Seeley. Vol. i., p. 287.

² Stagemann, quoted by Seeley. Vol. i., p. 462.

astonishing bravery and strength. What was the substitute for discipline? The home to which they hoped to return; the citizenship which protected the home, and which was involved in the conflict. Give a man the right and the power to be a proprietor,—to acquire and hold property,—and he must be the best of soldiers, because he is defending his own. Make a soldier of the man who cannot own and cannot acquire property, and he is without the highest incentive to bravery. Had the French army of ten years ago been drawn from the farmers of France, and subjected to the same drill which the German troops carried to the field, with equal generalship, shall it be prudently said that the result would have been precisely the same? But the supreme virtue of the possession of property is not that it makes a man a soldier. It is that it makes him a man of peace. Property is the police of the world. It is the preserver of the world's peace. Is it not strange that peasant proprietary has not occurred to English statesmanship as the permanent pacifier of Ireland?

Shall we go to Russia? In the cold, slow, and barbarous North England should not find much to learn. Yet she is perplexed with the problem how to make five millions of her subjects owners of twenty million acres of the land on which they live. The czar, with no constitution to restrain him, with no law but his own will, with little statesmanship,—for what is statesmanship but the antithesis of despotism,—a Russian czar found a way to take an area equal to one-seventh of the habitable globe, and so transform eight times the population of Ireland that they ceased to be serfs and could become proprietors. Can the Irish problem become insoluble in the light of Russian emancipation and Russian peasant proprietary? Twenty per cent. of the entire cultivable area of Russia is owned and tilled by peasant proprietors. Does any thoughtful reader of history need to be told that the emperor, to whom that humane and redeeming act is due, thereby saved his throne, postponed revolution,—in a country without a constitution it must eventually come,—and attached the army of peasants so strongly to his person that they are to-day his preservers and the protection of property and life in the empire?

Nor did the emperor create peasant proprietary by wholesale confiscation. The owners of the serfs were compensated for their land on a scale of payment by which the previous labor of the serf was estimated at a yearly rental of six per cent. Of the sum required to carry out the provisions of the edict, the peasant was required to pay twenty per cent.; the government advanced the balance, securing itself at intervals extending over forty-nine years. All these arrangements were completed in 1865; from that time serfdom entirely ceased in Russia, and the progress of peasant pro-

prietary has been uninterrupted. Said the Emperor Nicholas to the marshals of the noblesse, in 1856: "It is better to abolish serfage from above than to await the time when it will begin to abolish itself from below."¹ Catholic emancipation was not granted from above until Wellington told the king that it would be snatched from below. The Irish Church was not abolished from above until Gladstone saw that the foundations were in imminent danger. Wellington told the king he must choose between emancipation and insurrection. Gladstone has publicly avowed that the much-derided Fenian made the disestablishment a political necessity. In Russia, then, a czar allows reforms from above in order to take the credit to the state for doing voluntarily what it might have to do under compulsion. The English government allows no reforms from above except under compulsion from below,—at least in Ireland.

Certainly at least in Ireland; for let us turn to India. What is the story of British legislation there concerning land?

The area of British India is 899,341 square miles. The population is 191,096,603. The government claims the land as its own, and has regularly drawn from it a revenue largely in excess of that from salt and opium together. For ten years past it has averaged twenty million pounds. Before the mutiny, the East India Company was so thrifty a landlord that it drew one-half its total receipts from the land. While the imperial legislation concerning land in India was not uniform in all the provinces, much being left to the apparent exigencies of situation and time, certain principles, it is asserted, are found to be generally present. An acknowledged deference has been shown to claims of clear title of native origin. The greatest respect has been shown for the rights of working farmers. The tenants have been carefully protected against the oppression of their landlords. The state, as chief landlord in India, has held the land, it is alleged, not as its absolute property, but as a possession in partnership with the tenant, whose right to live off it was the first of all rights.

The pen of the historian will yet point to the fact, already sufficiently apparent, that, just in proportion as the imperial government dealt justly with the Indian tenant the government of the empire was submitted to, and that the enormous expenses which the treasury has had to meet for the retention of the Indian domain would have been considerably lessened had the rights of tenants been more sacredly and more judiciously considered.

If we should take the assertions of the government commissioner, Sir George Campbell, the land legislation for India has been, in

¹ Russia, by D. Mackenzie Wallace, p. 485.

some provinces, ideally perfect. How strange, then, that famines are occurring there with dreadful frequency,—not famines of food, for the land continues to pay enormous profits on its products,—but famines of money; the middleman and the state take everything the land can be induced to yield, and the peasant has neither produce nor money left!

Speaking of the remarkable liberality of the empire in settling disputes of title, Sir George Campbell says: "Renouncing the ordinary *de facto* powers of native princes, we have recognized, as valid and binding, all grants made by any authority which was at the time competent to make them, and have given the grantees complete and certain tenure, instead of the precarious tenure at the pleasure of the prince at the time being." Insecurity of tenure is obnoxious, it will be observed, in India. "All incomplete tenures having some show of long possession, or other equitable claim, we have treated very tenderly, either maintaining them or giving them terms of very easy compromise." There are tenures of long possession in Ireland, in which there is the claim of bog made into meadow, of mountain turned into pasture, by the industry of the tenant; yet the landlord may eject the man who did it all, and there is no law to compel him to take into account any claim whatever upon him or his property. But the rights of the Mohammedan were most "tenderly weighed," lest any injustice should be done him. "We have not only professed this indulgent treatment, but we have embodied these lenient rules in public laws, and have opened the courts of justice to all who wish to appeal to them from the decisions of the executive officers." All lands to which titles were thus procured are revenue free forever.

But now as to lands held subject to revenue, lands the title of which resides in the state. Is it absolute title, or is it a partnership with the tenant who occupies and tills, and with the middleman who is a kind of political support of the state, and lives off the land and the working tenant?

There were land laws and customs of tenure in India before the British conquered the country. In those laws and customs nearly everything that the Irish tenant is begging to-day were to be found. There was compensation for improvements. There was practically fixity of tenure so long as the rent was paid.

Bengal was the first province in which the British applied reform. Sir George Campbell points out that the government recognized the tenant as entitled to fixity of tenure while he paid his rent, and as entitled to protection against an increase of rent at the caprice of the middlemen, from whom the government collected the land revenue, and who held a curious position between the

tenant and the state. The law became settled that every working tenant who was in possession at least twelve years at uniform rent was entitled to his holding forever at that rent. Sir George Campbell is of opinion that these arrangements were just, and that the subsequent ground for complaint is to be found in the failure properly to carry them out. But let us get at them more closely. The tenant farmer is the ryot. The landlord from whom he leased was the zemeendar. The state had nothing to do with the ryot except to protect him against the zemeendar. The latter was the nominal landlord. He executed the lease; he collected the rent from the ryot; but the state claimed to divide with both him and the ryot the real ownership of the land and its produce. The share which the state claimed was ten-elevenths of what the zemeendar got from the ryot. Is it any wonder that the zemeendars were soon engaged in the general enterprise of extracting almost eleven-elevenths of all the ryot could get out of the land? The historian of land tenure in India admits "English ideas of the rights of a landlord and of the advantage of non-interference began to prevail." "It has been epigrammatically said," reports Campbell, "that Lord Cornwallis designed to make English landlords in Bengal, and only succeeded in making Irish landlords."

In the Northwest provinces the early legislation differed somewhat from that in Bengal; but in 1822 the regulation was adopted which is the basis of all subsequent land law in Northern India. Occupants were to have long leases with the right of renewal at revaluation, and these rights were to be transferable,—a recognition of Ulster tenant right in India, although it was not recognized as law in Ireland. The ryots were to be secure in their holdings as long as they paid their rent. Ryots who had been twelve years in occupancy were deemed to have acquired the right permanently; and eviction was never thought of by any one. If the zemeendar desired to raise the rent he had to go before a court, prove that the permanent value had been increased in some way other than by the exertion of the tenant, and thus obtain the power to increase the rent. "The course of procedure was, however, difficult; the right hardly known." Occupancy rents continued unvaried until the government introduced a new rent law. But even this did not secure peace. The principles were correct enough so far as they went. Why should mutiny arise? It was found that the principle was better than the practice. It "was found that the position of the ryots had not been sufficiently defined," discreetly remarks Mr. Campbell.

The Punjab did not become British territory until 1849. In settling the land question there, the same principles were ostentatiously adopted. The tenants were carefully protected. The

legislation of 1859 confers upon ryots forever their holdings at an unchangeable rent. If any increase is to be allowed the zemeendar in the rent, he can get it only after demonstrating in court that the value of the holding has been permanently improved without expense to or by the labor of the ryot. If a ryot desires to surrender a lease, he may carry away with him everything he placed on the land which is not sunk in the soil. When the thirty years' settlement of the Northwestern provinces expired, a new settlement took place, and the government reduced its proportion of the rent. Instead of two-thirds, it was content with one-half.

In Oude, after the mutiny, a different course was tried. The ryot was no longer to be regarded as having any rights worthy of consideration. The government was going to be a strong one; it should be a government of landlords. So all the land was confiscated, and was assigned again according to the plan followed by Elizabeth in Ireland. A judicial decision was obtained dissipating the principles which the government had professed to follow in all previous legislation. After much discussion it was determined to protect a few favored ryots who set up hereditary claims, or whose loyalty was above suspicion. All other tenants were reduced to tenancies at will, and the system of rackrents went speedily into operation.

Campbell writes: "Already we hear of the service of notices of ejectment in large numbers, and on the other hand, of combinations of the tenants to resist these proceedings." And the government lent money to the landlords, not to improve their estates, but to stave off their creditors.

In the central provinces the ryot rights were respected.

Summing up all the legislation affecting the tenure of land in India by Great Britain, Sir George Campbell thus describes its present status:

Oude. Great zemeendars, almost complete owners, with few subordinate rights.

Northwest provinces. Moderate proprietors; old ryots have also a measure of fixity of tenure at a fair rent.

Bengal. Great zemeendars whose rights are limited. Numerous sub-proprietors of several grades under them. Ancient ryots who have both fixity of tenure and fixity of rent. Other old ryots who have fixity of tenure, at fair rent, variable from time to time.

Central provinces. Moderate proprietors. Ancient ryots who are sub-proprietors of their holdings at rents fixed for the term of each settlement. Other old ryots who have fixity of tenure at fair rent.

Madras and Bombay. The ryots are complete masters of the soil, subject only to payment of revenue.

It will be observed, therefore, that with the exception of a single province, Great Britain has given to its Indian subjects a virtual peasant proprietary, more or less modified ; or, where there is tenantry, fixity of tenure, and reasonable fixity of rent. Great Britain has done more, therefore, for her Indian subjects in half a century than she has done for her Irish subjects in nearly seven centuries. The principles which she has generally professed in adjusting land settlements in India, are the principles which the Irish tenant has not been able to induce her legislators to recognize in their land legislation for Ireland.

The state is the only landlord in Bombay. There the middleman has been almost entirely dispensed with, and the government deals directly with the tenant. There, then, we shall find the ideal relationship of landlord and tenant according to the standard of modern British statesmanship.

“ The survey and assessment of the Bombay presidency has been almost completed on a system introduced and carefully elaborated twenty years ago. The whole country is surveyed and mapped, and the fields distinguished by permanent boundary marks, which it is penal to remove ; the soil of each field is classed according to its intrinsic qualities, and to the climate ; and the rate of assessment to be paid on fields of each class in each subdivision of a district is fixed on a careful consideration of the value of the crops they are capable of producing, as affected by the proximity to market towns, canals, railways, and similar external incidents, but not by improvements made by the ryot himself. This rate was probably about one-half the yearly value of the land when fixed, but, owing to the general improvement of the country, it is not more than from a fourth to an eighth in the districts which have not been settled quite recently. The measurement and classification of the soil are made once for all ; but the rate of assessment is open to revision at the end of every thirty years, in order that the ryot, on the one hand, may have the certainty of the long period as an inducement to lay out capital, and the state, on the other, may secure that participation in the advantages accruing from the general progress of society to which its joint proprietorship in the land entitles it. In the thirty years' revision, moreover, only public improvements and a general change of prices, but not improvements effected by the ryots themselves, are considered as grounds for enhancing the assessment. The ryot's tenure is permanent, provided he pays the assessment.”¹

In Bombay, therefore, where the English government is sole and actual landlord, we find first, fixity of tenure ; second, no increase

¹ Statesman's Yearbook, 1880, p. 681.

in rent except once every thirty years, and then after a fair valuation, in which the improvements effected by the tenant are not made the cause of increasing his rent; third, the state makes all the improvements of a permanent kind at its own expense. The rent is fixed on a fair valuation of the producing power of the farm and the relative cost of getting it to market.

Such is land law under the English government in Bombay. What is land law under the Irish landlord, protected by the English government in Ireland? No security of tenure; perpetual notice to quit. No fixity of rent; perpetual liability to increase. No inducement to improve the land; every inducement not to improve it. No assurance that if the tenant spends money and labor in improving the land, he will not be compelled to pay more rent on account of the improvement effected by himself; on the contrary, a moral certainty that the rent will be increased the moment the improvements are discovered. In India the English government recognizes the tiller of the soil as in partnership with the lord of the soil. In Ireland the law recognizes the tiller of the soil as having no rights except what the lord chooses to grant him.

Which stands condemned; the English government in Bombay or the English government in Ireland? Are British subjects to be imprisoned in Ireland for requesting for themselves the rights of British subjects in Bombay? Or is it better to be an Indian than to be an Irishman, to be a Mohammedan than to be a Christian?

V.

TESTIMONY OF ENGLISH ECONOMISTS CONCERNING THE IRISH LAND SYSTEM.

"In Great Britain the competitors are independent capitalists, bidding for land as one among the many modes of profitable investment which the complex industrial civilization of the country supplies. In Ireland they are men for the most part on the verge of absolute pauperism, who can see in a few acres of land their sole escape—we cannot now say from starvation, but at best from emigration and the workhouse. Is it strange that the result should be different in the two cases, and that rent, which in England and Scotland represents exceptional profit, should in Ireland be the utmost penny that can be wrung from a poverty-stricken cultivator? Judging from their ordinary existence, there is perhaps little to distinguish the cottier from the serf. Nevertheless they are not the same. The serf is *adscriptus glebæ*; the Irish cottier, as he knows by painful experience, is bound to the soil by no tie save those imposed by his own necessities. He has unbounded freedom to relinquish when he pleases his farm and home, and to transfer himself to the other side of the Atlantic; and he pays for

the privilege in the liability to which the serf is a stranger, of being expelled from his farm and home when it suits the views of his landlord."¹ Professor Cairnes wrote before the serf was transformed into a proprietor. The Irish cottier's serfage has grown steadily worse. But he wrote his preface after the passage of the Gladstone act of 1870. He clearly sees that that did not settle the Irish land question.

"What is Ireland worth to you now? What is Ireland worth to you at all? Is she not the very symbol and token of your disgrace to the whole world? There was scarcely a part of the globe from which subscriptions did not come. The Pope, as was very natural, subscribed. The head of the great Mohammedan Empire (the Grand Seigneur) sent his thousand pounds. The uttermost parts of the earth sent in their donations. A tribe of red Indians on the American continent sent their subscription; and I have it on good authority that even the slaves on a plantation in one of the Carolinas subscribed their sorrowful mite that the miseries of Ireland might be relieved. The whole world looked upon the condition of Ireland, and helped to mitigate her miseries. What can we say to all those contributors, who, now that they have paid, must be anxious to know if anything is done to prevent a recurrence of these calamities?" Were not these words uttered within six months, and by an excited Irishman? No, alas! It was John Bright who spoke in the House of Commons twenty-two years ago! Since then the slave of the Carolinas has become a freeman, and the sons of those whom landlordism drove from Ireland helped loose his chain. The Grand Seigneurs have had varying fortune, but never has the helping hand of England been withdrawn from them. The Pope, whose subscription went to Ireland in 1847, has passed away, and another sits in his place. But nothing has been done in all the intervening time for the Irish tenant. In 1880, again, a Pope sent a subscription; again the whole world saw the misery of Ireland, and helped relieve it. And has anything yet been done to prevent another famine in another decade? "We must tell them with blushes that nothing has been done," said John Bright in 1849. Nor has anything been done to this hour. A gentleman told Mr. Bright that the famine of that period was the ordering of Providence. He cannot accept that conclusion. "God has blessed Ireland, and does still bless her, in position, in soil, in climate. He has not withdrawn his promises, nor are they unfulfilled. There is still the sunshine and the shower; still the seedtime and the harvest; and the affluent bosom of the earth still offers sustenance for man." What was the remedy?

¹ Political Essays, pp. 160, 161.

"We must free the land," said John Bright; and on every occasion since that day John Bright has told the English people the same truth. No living man has spoken more explicitly or more positively on the Irish land question than he. There has been no attempt to restrain him of his liberty on account of it. Freedom of speech in Ireland is one thing; freedom of speech in England is another. Bright's language expresses lofty and pure economy in England; in Ireland it would be conspiracy against the Queen's peace.

In 1866 Mr. Bright said: "An honorable member from Ireland a few nights ago referred to the character of the Irish people. He said, and I believe it is true, that there is no Christian nation with which we are acquainted amongst the people of which crime of the ordinary character, as we reckon it in this country, is so rare as amongst his countrymen. He might have said also that there is no people, whatever they may be at home, more industrious than his countrymen in every country but their own. He might have said more: that they are a people of cheerful and joyous temperament. He might have said more than this: that they are singularly grateful for kindnesses shown them. And yet with such materials and with such a people, after centuries of government,—after sixty-five years of government by this House,—you have them embittered against your rule. Sixty-five years ago this Parliament undertook to govern Ireland. I will say nothing of the manner in which that duty was brought upon us, except this, that it was by proceedings disgraceful and corrupt to the last degree. During these sixty-five years . . . there are only three considerable measures which Parliament has passed in the interest of Ireland. One of them was the measure of 1829 for the emancipation of the Catholics. . . . But that measure, so just, so essential, and which, of course, is not ever to be recalled, was a measure which the chief minister of the day, a great soldier and a great judge of military matters, admitted was passed under the menace of and only because of the danger of civil war. The other two measures to which I have referred are that for the relief of the poor and that for the sale of the incumbered estates; and those measures were introduced to the House and passed through the House in the emergency of a famine more severe than any that has desolated any Christian country of the world within the last four hundred years. Except on these two emergencies, I appeal to every Irish member, and to every English member who has paid any attention to the matter, whether the statement is not true that this Parliament has done nothing for the people of Ireland."

In 1866, on another occasion, John Bright said: "The great evil of Ireland is this, that the Irish people—the Irish nation—are

dispossessed of the soil; and what we ought to do is to provide for and aid in their restoration to it by all measures of justice. Why should we tolerate in Ireland the law of primogeniture? Why should we tolerate the system of entails? Why should the object of the law be to accumulate land in great masses in few hands, and to make it almost impossible for persons of small means and tenant farmers to become possessors of land? If you go to other countries—for example, to Norway, to Denmark, to Holland, to Belgium, to France, to Germany, to Italy, or to the United States—you will find that in all these countries those laws of which I complain have been abolished, and the land is just as free to buy, and sell, and hold, and cultivate as any other description of property in the kingdom. . . . If my advice were taken, we should have a parliamentary commission empowered to buy up the large estates in Ireland belonging to the English nobility, for the purpose of selling them on easy terms to the occupiers of the farms and to the tenantry of Ireland. . . . What you want is to restore to Ireland a middle-class proprietary of the soil; and I venture to say that if these estates could be purchased and could be sold out, farm by farm, to the tenant occupiers in Ireland, it would be infinitely better in a conservative sense than that they should belong to great proprietors living out of the country. . . . I have often asked myself whether patriotism is dead in Ireland. *Cannot all the people of Ireland see that the calamities of their country are the creatures of the law, and if that be so, that just laws only can remove them?*"

Still later in the same year Mr. Bright defined in detail his plan for the purchase of a portion of the Irish land by the government and its sale to actual occupiers.

In 1868, in the House of Commons, Mr. Bright spoke again on peasant proprietary in Ireland. He proposed that the state lend the money to the tenant to buy, securing itself, and giving him thirty-one or thirty-five years to refund it. "I would negotiate with landowners who were willing to sell the tenants who were willing to buy, and I would make the land the great savings bank for the future tenantry of Ireland."

The still more recent speeches of Mr. Bright have been in the same vein. I have preferred to quote from those made in former years to show that the proposition to buy a portion of the land in Ireland is not a novel one, and that it was advocated by an eminent English economist before the Irish Land League came into existence.

Mr. Bright does not stand alone among exalted Englishmen in his characterization of the Irish land system. In his speeches advocating the passage of his Land Act of 1870, Mr. Gladstone laid down some propositions as radical as some by Mr. Bright. One

of these, as important as any, we shall return to when we reach a very grave aspect of the consequences of correct legislation on the land question: the influence of that legislation in effecting a permanent pacification of Ireland. A summary of a part of one speech is sufficient in this place, for it covers the entire subject. "Insecurity of tenure manifested itself in four modes—in the withdrawal of privileges hitherto enjoyed by the tenant, in the lavish and pitiless use of notices to quit, in evictions, and in the raising of rents where the increased value of farms had been caused by the tenants' improvements."¹ Mr. Gladstone's bill has not corrected the evil it professed, indeed, to touch most daintily, because, in the words of his admiring biographer, it did not "confiscate a single valuable right of the Irish landowner." It was some of his valuable rights that should have been confiscated.

Speaking of the neglect of Ireland by his own countrymen, Richard Cobden indignantly exclaims: "We lavish our sympathies upon the serfs of Poland and the slaves of Turkey; but who would not prefer to be one of these to the perishing with hunger in the name of freeman? We send forth our missionaries to convert the heathen; but well might the followers of Mahomet or Zoroaster instruct us in the ways of charity to our poor Christian brethren."

Space will not permit the making of extracts at length from recent literature on this subject. The reader's attention is directed to the following: "Peasant Proprietors at Home," by J. H. Tuke, in *The Nineteenth Century*, August, 1880; "The Public Interest in Agricultural Reform," by William E. Bear, in the same periodical, August and September, 1879; "Free Land and Peasant Proprietorship," in *The Nineteenth Century*, February, 1880; and the remarkable essay in the same monthly for September, 1880, by James Anthony Froude. In a galling and drastic paper, written with that malignant energy of style and vivid pictorial power which have made the historian so easy to read and so easy to mistrust, this willing and excited hater of the Irish people becomes for a moment tranquil and drops a telling fact in the face of the adversaries of peasant proprietary in Ireland, namely, that the island, properly farmed, would sustain twice its present population. For a moment he forgets his theme, and formulates an abstract truth. "The land in any country is really the property of the nation which occupies it."

Upon the subject of absenteeism the most emphatic testimony has been borne by many English writers. So far as I am aware, only one has ever professed to believe it aught but a monstrous evil

¹ The Life of the Right Honorable William Ewart Gladstone, by George Bennett Smith, p. 389.

and a cruel curse. That one was so fallacious in his reasoning that he only made the truth more transparent. It is an ancient evil, and in former times legislation undertook with no success to remedy it. Taxation was tried. Confiscation of a portion of the absentee's estate was decreed. Swift exposed all its hideous features. The free and the last Irish Parliament endeavored to grapple with it; but the class at whom the proposed act was levelled had retainers enough to protect their interests. The abolition of the Parliament and the transfer of the seat of legislation for Ireland to the English capital aggravated absenteeism by increasing the inducements to live out of Ireland. One who has no sympathy with the movement now going on there, writes:¹ "This is not a matter upon which one is left to speculate, for there is visible proof of the results of the two systems, the system of residence and the system of absenteeism. Those parts of Ireland which are to-day best disposed to the English Government, which are freest from political agitation, which are the most peaceful and law-abiding, and in which the people are most generally enlightened, liberal, and tolerant, are just those places where the landowners have been longest and most constantly resident, and have for generations faithfully performed the duties of their position. Those parts of Ireland where the people are most lawless, most ignorant, most superstitious, poor and backward, are the places where absenteeism has thrown its blighting influence, and where the people have been left to themselves. Had absentees but done their duty, the result for many past years and in the present day would have been far different. Unfortunately, as it is, disturbance, crime, political agitation, and disaffection to England, these were and are the Nemesis of absenteeism, a Nemesis visited unfortunately, not on the absentees, but on the kingdom itself."

Morally considered, absenteeism is one of the most powerful agents in reducing the Irish tenantry to poverty and keeping them in it. Many a landlord who resides always, or nearly always, in England or on the Continent, would, if he lived upon his own estates, be touched by the distress of his dependents. His representative has the strongest motive to resist every instinct of humanity. He is paid in proportion to the amount of rent he can extort from the tenants and send to his distant master. Absenteeism is, therefore, one of the great influences which will fight to the last against any proposition to give the tenants fixity of tenure, which would protect them from the arbitrary raising of rent at any time when it pleased the absentee or his bailiff to order an increase. The bailiff is rewarded, also, proportionately as he keeps the expenses

¹ H. L. Jephson, in *The Nineteenth Century*, May, 1880.

of the estate down. Absenteeism is, therefore, one of the principal causes of the wretched condition of so large a part of the lands.

Absenteeism will never willingly consent to the enactment of any law easily enforced for compelling the landlord to compensate the tenant for money or labor spent in making permanent improvements.

Materially considered, absenteeism is the cause of an enormous loss to the people of Ireland. By the census of 1871 the number of absentee landlords was nearly three thousand. They own more than one-third of the cultivated land of the kingdom. More than one-third the revenue of a country drawn annually out of it in cash, or produce for which no return goes back to the land or the tillers, is an evil which, it is perfectly safe to say, no government on earth would tolerate for generations, except the foreign government which treats Ireland like an alien colony and lets foreigners annually drain it of its only wealth.

To apply legislation to the evil of absenteeism is one of the most difficult problems involved in the Irish land question. A man may do what he pleases with his own. The landlord who has estates in Ireland may surely claim the right to spend his income in the shops of Paris and the gaming-houses of London as freely as his companion whose estates lie in England. There seems to be but one remedy for the evil. When the people were dying by tens of thousands of hunger in 1847, food enough was being shipped under their very eyes to feed more than all who were hungry. It was not, according to law, their property. They could not touch it. They had drawn it from the teeming earth. It was the fruit of their toil. But it was not theirs. It belonged to the absentee landlord. It was being exported to his commission men in London and Liverpool, and they would hand the proceeds over to him in gold. Not a penny of the gold would go back to Ireland. The law of human nature, which is higher than all other laws, would have justified those famishing people in seizing the produce and saving their lives and that of their children with it, would it not? Then will not the law of human nature justify the British Government in saying to these absentees: "Take the cash value of your land, spend it abroad, if you like; but leave the land to feed those who till it?" Is an equitable sale immoral because enforced? Or are the rights of property in three thousand persons superior to the rights of life in five millions? It must be apparent to every reasoning mind that so long as absenteeism remains a feature of the Irish land tenure, no genuine reform of that tenure can take place. A country one-third of whose revenue is annually spent

abroad, without return of any exchange, cannot prosper. It is impossible.

VI.

EFFORTS TO AMELIORATE IT.

Let us now look at the Irish land system in the light which has been cast upon it.

The penal laws¹ and legislation, penal in effect but not in name, deprived four-fifths of the people of Ireland of property in land in Ireland and of the legal right to acquire it.

The Irish Parliament was composed, in the brief period of its independence, of representatives of only the one-fifth of the people who were legally capable of owning land. It is not surprising that it did nothing to reform the land system.

The Irish Parliament was abolished by the Act of Union in 1800, and since then all legislation for Ireland has been enacted in the British Parliament.

What has that Parliament done for the reform of the Irish land system?

The Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 removed all political disabilities (with some exceptions not worth noticing in this place) which had kept four-fifths of the people of Ireland from the civil rights enjoyed by the one-fifth. That act made it possible for the people to acquire land by purchase, if they had the money and if there was any land in the market. But it did not restore to the heirs of those whose civil rights had been taken away by the penal laws the land which had been confiscated by those laws. Had O'Connell been as wise as he was energetic he would have made the restoration of the land a condition of the abolition of the statutes in accordance with which the land was confiscated. It may be objected that this would have been impracticable, on account of transfers and the difficulty of establishing heirship. The simplest way would have been perfectly satisfactory to a majority of the people. The rights of the owners in possession could have been respected, as they were in Prussia in the beginning of the century, and in Russia in the latter half of it. The state, which took the land away from the people of Ireland without compensation, could have found a way to restore it to them by compensating those who had obtained possession of it. Peasant proprietors could have been easily created in Ireland fifty years ago.

¹ The American who wishes to inform himself on the penal laws will find that code fully described by William Hartpole Lecky, author of the *History of Rationalism*, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, etc., in his volume on *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, article O'Connell.

But the land was not restored. The heirs of the original owners had sunk into tenantry and poverty. The land remains in the possession of the heirs of those who obtained it first by confiscation. What has the British Parliament done to improve their condition?

The characteristics of that condition are already perfectly familiar. Their labor is subjected to perpetual confiscation, because the improvements it effected were and are the property of the landlord. Any money which they put into the soil is confiscated in the same way. They are liable to be turned out of their farms at any time. The rent may be increased at any time. The rate of rent is kept at the highest figure of the keenest competition. The tenants are thus compelled to live in constant poverty. Constant poverty means in any country unlighted ignorance. The ragged, lawless, and thriftless train that follow poverty and ignorance, the imagination of the American can conceive. It needs no depiction.

The British Parliament has legislated for Ireland for eighty years. What has it done to reform such a land system?

Nearly half a century passed without the adoption of a single measure to that end! Then what?

Poor relief is the first lien on land in England. The like law providing for the relief of the poor of Ireland was not passed until 1846, and then only because the famine-shadow was already palpable. But the law does not operate to support the poor. If the people of Ireland had not been furnished with money to buy food from the landlords last winter the mortality would have compared with that of 1847.

The law is so constructed that the burden is a minimum on the landlord, and when famine comes the people must die if foreign charity does not hasten to their succor. This was abundantly proven last winter and spring.

The next legislation to modify the evils of the Irish land system was the Encumbered Estates Act. But that was an act for the relief of Irish landlords.

Until its passage in 1848 the law of primogeniture and entail, still the law of England, was the law in Ireland. The Encumbered Estates Act set that law aside. It compelled the sale of estates encumbered to half their value. The sale was made on the petition of the owner or any of his creditors, and the proceeds were divided among the claimants. In 1858 to that law was added the Landed Estates Act, by which the courts can deal with unencumbered as well as with encumbered estates. Under the old law of primogeniture and entail many of the Irish landlords had hopelessly bankrupted themselves. "A mountain-load of mortgages or a network of settlements rendered them powerless." The law freeing them of their

bonds put the land in the market, and enabled them to get rid of their debts. But at the time the law was passed there was no market for land. The famine had paralyzed the country. The immediate effect of the law, therefore, was to rob many creditors of their just dues. The law compelled creditors to submit to a sale, notwithstanding that they had an express contract that no one should ever disturb them in their claim on the land except by paying the claim in full. The new law coerced violation of contract. Says Professor Cairnes: "It proceeded according to rules unknown to our system of jurisprudence; it set aside solemn contracts; it disregarded the cherished traditions of real property law." He admits that it would not be easy to disturb the statements of Isaac Butt, that, at a time of unprecedented depreciation of the value of land, it compelled a general auction of Irish estates; and that no more violent interference with vested rights can be found in English history. But, notwithstanding the justness of this criticism, does any one condemn the principle of the law? Professor Cairnes admits that according to the received maxims of English jurisprudence it was a measure of confiscation; "yet it is not less certain that of all measures passed in recent times it is that one of which the beneficial effects have been most widely and cordially recognized." If the English government for Ireland could pass, more than thirty years ago, a law for the benefit of Irish landlords, invading vested rights, need so much outcry be made about a proposition to pass a law for the benefit of Irish tenants which may apparently, but will not actually, assail vested rights?

The most specious objection which has been urged against any attempt on the part of the government to buy the land of Ireland from the present owners and sell it to the present tillers, is that it would interfere with vested rights and freedom of contract. The government has a most convenient and a universally approved precedent in the Encumbered Estates Act. That act did the tenantry no good. But the principle is worth something. The landlords have enjoyed the benefits of it. Why not give the tenants the benefit?

Of course, the objection of coercion of violation of contract under certain circumstances will not carry far with Americans. About twenty-five years ago we heard a good deal on that text in this country. In a certain section there was a kind of property held under the law. That property was labor, instead of land. Its ownership was a vested right. A proclamation issued by a president of the United States swept away that vested right and destroyed the ownership of that property. That proclamation was a stupendous coercion of violation of contract. It was the mightiest invasion and destruction of vested rights which the world has ever

beheld. Torrents of precious blood, millions of treasure, were expended to destroy those vested rights. And when it was all done, and the nation which did it found calmness to reflect upon it, the sanction of deliberation was solemnly affixed to the procedure. A constitutional amendment forever forbade any compensation to those whose vested rights were destroyed!

It is not within the bounds of consistency for any American to oppose the invasion and destruction of vested rights when a gigantic moral wrong is intrenched in those rights and cannot be reached except through them, and cannot be righted except by their destruction.

The English Government invaded and overthrew vested rights and coerced violation of contract in Ireland by the passage of the Encumbered Estates Act. Then it was for the benefit of a small class. Now a similar procedure is suggested for the benefit of an entire nation. Shall it be declared immoral and unjust?

From the testimony of Englishmen before the reader, it is not the language of exaggeration to say that the condition of the black slave in the Southern States before emancipation was better than that of the Irish tenant under the Irish land system. The slave had food enough always. He was in a climate which was satisfied with little clothing, and he had enough. He had shelter always. He had not the gnawing consciousness that the land of his master was his land. He was born a slave. The Irish tenant suffers all his wrongs and more. Ostensibly born a freeman, he is actually a slave, so far as his tenant state goes. Nay, in that relation, he is worse off than the slave was, for he is often without enough to eat. He is often without enough clothing. He is often utterly without shelter. The slave's labor was confiscated. So is his. The slave could not acquire money. He can, but it is confiscated in the raising of his rent as soon as the fact is discovered. The slave always had a field to work in. The Irish tenant has not. The slave always had a subsistence out of the field he tilled. The Irish tenant has not. Tens of thousands of these worse than slaves, driven out of their own fields by hunger and carried to these shores by charity, laid down their lives to free the black slave. They were engaged in invading vested rights then. They were conspirators, destroying ownership in property. They were guilty of abetting with their blood coercion of violation of contract. They died manfully in that achievement. Now arises a voice in the same land protesting that there must be no amelioration of the serfdom of their people in their native land!

But the protest is neither loud nor deep. When the truth is clear to the American people they intrepidly uphold it. Against

the truth vested rights disappear like a film before the rosy morning.

Whatever opposition has been heard in the United States to the reform of the Irish land laws has been made on a misunderstanding of the facts.

We have seen two pieces of legislation which were intended to affect the Irish land tenure. The first was a law making the support of the poor a lien on the land. It is so constructed as to make Irish poverty a lien instead on the charity of the world.

The second was the Encumbered Estates Act. But that was for the benefit of Irish landlords.

The third was the Gladstone land law of 1870.

Its aim was good. On its passage through Parliament it encountered no less than three hundred amendments. When it emerged from the legislature and entered the presence of her majesty for signature, it had not confiscated a single valuable right of the Irish landlord, says the approved biographer, its author.

The avowed object of the Liberal minister was to make Ulster tenant right law throughout Ireland. That was all. Ulster tenant right is an institution which sadly recalls the pitiless efforts of former days to drive the Irish people off the land of their country for the purpose of planting it with foreign colonists. The tenant farmers in Ulster were chiefly Protestants, Irish, Scotch, and English, and to encourage them it was agreed by common consent that they should have continuous occupancy of their farms at fair rent. In other words, they were given fixity of tenure. The abstract right became a substantial property. If the tenant chose to give up his farm, he had the right to sell his fixity of tenure as a kind of goodwill to his successor. The substantial value of the tenant right was based on the improvements effected by him on the land. These improvements did not become the property of the landlord. They remained the property of the tenant and gave him a sort of partnership in the land. This was tenant right. The custom which fostered it never obtained in other parts of the kingdom, where the landlords were of one religion and the tenants of another. Tenant right did not secure against eviction for non-payment of rent. But if the tenant were compelled to give up his holding because he could not meet his obligation to the landlord, he was not turned out penniless into the road. He could dispose of his tenant right to whoever would pay him the highest price for it; the debt to the landlord was the first to be settled out of the proceeds; the balance was his own. It was and is, in fact, compensation for improvements paid on eviction, not by the landlord, but by the incoming tenant, who thus acquires a right of ownership in them and can in his turn dispose of them. The Glad-

stone act of 1870 attempted to make this practice of a locality the law for the country.

But it was only a fair-weather law. It should have been accompanied by a consort statute providing for perennially good harvests. When the bad crops came there were wholesale evictions for non-payment of rent ; yet the failure of the tenants to meet their obligations was not their fault ; it was the "Act of God." What good was Ulster tenant right then ? The tenants who had not crops enough to pay rent, had no money to buy tenant right from other tenants equally unfortunate. Besides, the value of the tenant right was unstable, vague, shifting, uncertain. In many cases it was simply intangible. The evicted tenant had to go out ; if the condition of the market was such that there was no one to buy his tenant right, what good did the act of 1870 do him ? The premier's biographer was remarkably correct when he said that the act did not take away a single valuable right of the Irish landlord.

The act of 1870 was land reform on hypothesis. It did not touch the landlord. It did not always touch the tenant. In a season of high rents and fine crops it afforded the tenant such compensation for his improvements as he could induce some other tenant to pay him. If he could find no one to pay him anything, he must submit to his misfortune. But he lost his farm and all the labor, and all the money he may have expended on it.

There was a bill with a misleading title introduced into the last session. It was called "The Compensation for Disturbance bill." It was an attempt to compel landlords to allow to tenants evicted for non-payment of rent compensation for improvements, provided it was legally proven that their failure to meet their obligation was due to famine. The bill passed the Commons and was thrown out by the Lords. If anything were wanting to demonstrate that the Gladstone Act was hypothetical and fair-weather law the introduction of the last measure is sufficient.

This completes the entire record which the British Parliament has made for itself in reforming the Irish land laws.

The system is essentially what it was in the beginning of the century. The tenant has no legal rights. He lives in a state of compulsory degradation and destitution. He is liable to eviction at any moment. His rent may be increased at any moment. The rate of rent is so high, that when he has paid it there is nothing left with which to improve his condition or that of his family. If he cannot pay what the landlord chooses to demand he goes into the highway to starve. There is no other country in the world in which such a land system prevails.

VII.

THE INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CORRECT AND PERMANENT SETTLEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.

The United States is the heir in fact of the Irish land system.

The bequest has not been delivered in a single bulk to be appraised and classified, the useful to be put to use, the worthless to be thrown aside. Decade after decade, year after year, this legacy of squalor, ignorance, thriftlessness, rags, and helplessness has been transported over the sea and cast upon the American shore. Irish emigration began in the early part of the century. In 1820 it reached considerable proportions. Since then it has been incessant. In the life of one generation nearly three millions of the victims of the Irish land system have been disembarked at our ports. Nor did they come always of their own accord. Emigration is the only remedy which many British economists have been able to suggest for Irish misery, and it has even been officially recommended and assisted by government aid. The paradox of improving the condition of a people in their own country by sending them out of it can be found in sober treatises by grave English publicists. The chief pretence has been that the population is too dense for the soil. That is only a pretence. The real motive is to rid the country of a population which the soil is abundantly able to sustain if the landlords were willing to permit it. The landlords would gladly, according to the avowal of some of their defenders, sweep the people into the sea and turn the whole island into pasture-land. But whatever the motive which has been behind the constant exodus, two facts are manifest: that so long as the present land system remains emigration must continue, and the United States must give hospitality to most of it.

Therefore the Irish land system is a tax upon the American people for the benefit of Irish landlords and English manufacturers and tradesmen.

The burden of supporting the Irish in Ireland falls upon their relatives in the United States even in good times. The burden of supporting them in famine falls much more heavily on this country. The burden of receiving and taking care of the millions of the paupers made so by the Irish land system has been borne chiefly by the United States for half a century. The American people have, therefore, a direct interest in the correct and permanent settlement of the Irish land question.

Ireland is an English poorhouse supported by indirect taxation on the United States.

When the American colonies threw off their allegiance to Great

Britain, they should have insisted on one more clause in the treaty of peace. That clause ought to have been a demand for the reform of the Irish land tenure and the creation of peasant proprietary there. Having missed the opportunity of doing so, Great Britain was left in possession of the right to continue to tax the American people notwithstanding their political separation and sovereign independence. For the purpose of supporting English domination in Ireland, the government of Great Britain is still a tax-gatherer in the United States. Is this fanciful? Last winter charity was asked in every town and village of this country for the famine sufferers in Ireland. It was not food that was wanted; it was expressly declared that there was no scarcity of food in Ireland! There was famine, but there was no scarcity of food! It was money that was needed. Into whose pockets did the American money go? Into the pocket of the hungry Irish tenant? Certainly not. He never saw or touched it. It went to the Irish landlord to pay for the food which the hungry tenant had drawn from the soil, but which he could not eat until American money paid the landlord for it. The government protected the property of the landlord from appropriation by the hungry tenant until the American money arrived to pay for it. Is it fanciful to say that Ireland is an English poorhouse supported by taxation on the American people?

After the money from America had purchased food from the Irish landlord to feed the tenant whose labor had produced it, what direction did the money take? One-third went to the absentee landlords to be dissipated in the luxuries of the Continent or deposited in London banks to await their pleasure. Most of what remained was paid to English manufacturers for the exchanges which Irish landlords chose to purchase. England destroyed Irish manufactures as already shown. With the exception of his linen, which the Irish landlord can probably get cheaper in Belfast, or her lace which his lady may have made to order by the deft hands of underpaid Irish girls, all the purchases for the house, the family, the stable of the Irish landlord must be made in England. The money which the Americans sent last year to buy food for the Irish tenant found its final destination in the till of the English tradesman and manufacturer. It helped them pay their taxes. Is it fanciful to say that the English Government levies indirect taxation on the United States to maintain its mastery in Ireland?

It is not a sufficient answer that the Irish in the United States earn what they send to their relatives in the old country. Aye; they earn it hard enough. They work for every dollar of it. It is their own. They have a right to do what they please with it.

But they have not the *power* to do what they please with it. If they had, not a penny of it would go to the English manufacturer, and the English tradesman, and the enervated absentee on the Continent, as the price of maintaining in Ireland a land system which drove them forth paupers to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water, while it keeps steeped in poverty those whom they left behind! The Irish people in the United States have a claim upon the attention of American statesmanship which has not been considered. They have renounced allegiance to the British Empire. They are citizens of the Republic of the United States. Yet they are compelled to transmit a portion of their earnings annually for the support of a foreign government. They should be relieved of this burden. They should be enabled to spend their money among those from whom they get it. A large portion of the capital of the Irish people in the United States, accumulated from the savings of their industry, is annually sent out of the country and brings nothing back. Is it not the duty of American statesmanship to put a stop to this waste of our resources? The waste must go on so long as the Irish land system exists. The money earned in the United States should be employed in the United States.

So long as the Irish people continue to send money enough to Ireland to eke out subsistence for the tenantry, the English manufacturer and tradesman will oppose any genuine reform of land tenure there. The revenue which British steamship lines enjoy out of the land system which supplies them with living freight, is at the expense of people in America; their owners will resist the reform of the tenure. Peasant proprietary would be a check on emigration.

The people of the United States have a clear right to protest against an institution which is a burden upon themselves although situated in another country. Under the equities of international law as understood in modern times, they doubtless have a legal right to make such a protest. But they have a moral duty as well. The Irish land system should be abolished in the name of universal humanity; and public opinion in the United States should declare to the people of England, who are full in their hearts of the richest and purest sympathies, that they must compel their government to wipe off British soil a land system whose hideous and frightful features cannot be discerned in any other spot upon the habitable globe.

In the tranquil calm of history how much of the boast of modern civilization is found empty sham! Two centuries before Justinian the rights which the Irish tenant vainly begs to-day the tenant farmer of the Roman state enjoyed!

In the greatest effort which his eloquent lips made in urging

the passage of the act of 1870, Mr. Gladstone said: "What we wish is that where there has been despondency, there shall be hope; where there has been mistrust, there shall be confidence; where there has been alienation and hate, there shall, however gradually, be woven the ties of a strong attachment between man and man. This we know cannot be done in a day. The measure has reference to evils which have been long at work; their roots strike far back into bygone centuries. . . . And my hope at least is high and ardent that we shall live to see our work prosper in our hand, and that in Ireland, which we desire to unite to England and Scotland by the only enduring ties—those of free will and free affection—peace, order, and a settled and free industry will diffuse their blessings from year to year, and from day to day over a smiling land."

The Liberal minister's hope, although high and ardent, has been doomed to profound disappointment. It was inevitable that it should be. He correctly saw that reform of the land tenure and the gradual creation of peasant proprietary are probably the only means of permanently pacifying Ireland, and making her people contented units in the vast empire of which they have been thus far only the victims. But if the premier's perception was clear, his power was subject to fettering limitations. His bill "did not confiscate a single valuable right of the Irish landlord." That was its essential defect.

The Irish in Australia are contented and loyal. The Irish in Canada are contented and loyal. Why? Because they have all the rights which other subjects of the British Empire hold in those countries; they have substantially all the rights which the Irish in Ireland are denied. In Australia and Canada the people shape their own domestic laws. There is no spirit of insurrection in the Irish among them. They are as able as the other elements of the population to acquire property. They are in possession of all the rights and privileges which the English in England possess. Is it not blindness for the imperial government not to try the same pacifying and loyalizing remedy in Ireland?

There can never be peace there until the most brutal land system on earth is effaced. There can never be industry there until the people are allowed the rights with which British subjects in other countries are invested. Reform of the land system is the only permanent pacifier for Ireland. Root the people in the soil, and they will be deaf to all voices except those of their happy children. Give the land of Ireland to the people of Ireland and they will be their own constabulary; the proprietors will maintain the peace so that they may get the wealth out of their land. A land

system which periodically breeds famine in a country in which there is always plenty of food is accursed alike of God and man. The government which tolerates such a land system does not deserve peace, and cannot secure it.

"I think," writes Laveleye, the able inquirer into the subject of peasant proprietary in Europe, "the following propositions may be laid down as self-evident truths: there are no measures more conservative or more conducive to order in society than those which facilitate the acquirement of property in land by those who cultivate it; there are none fraught with more danger for the future than those which concentrate the ownership of the soil in the hands of a small number of families."¹

Said John Bright in Dublin fourteen years ago: "You men of Dublin and of Ireland, you never made a mistake more grievous in your lives than when you come to the conclusion that there are not millions of men in Great Britain willing to do you full justice. . . . When I have thought of the condition of Ireland, of its sorrows and wrongs, of the discredit that its condition has brought upon the English, the Irish, and the British name, I have thought, if I could be in all other things the same, but by birth an Irishman, there is not a town in this island I would not visit for the purpose of discussing the great Irish question, and of rousing my countrymen to some great and united action." He defined the question on another occasion: "The great evil of Ireland is this, that the Irish people—the Irish nation—are dispossessed of the soil, and what we ought to do is to provide for and aid in their restoration to it by all measures of justice."

¹ *Systems of Land Tenure*, p. 281.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD DEMONSTRATED.

I.

TO deny the existence of God has for about a century been considered by certain men as the highest wisdom, as the very perfection of philosophy. Many thinkers of modern times, pretending to have attained a deeper insight into the nature of the human mind than the ancients, boast of having discovered that the idea of God is a mere illusion, resulting from our subjective framework. Others, searching into matter and its forces, have found that the material world bears in itself the sufficient reason both of its existence and its phenomena, and needs no outward cause to produce it and put order into it. Theism, therefore, was, as they say, only the result of the ignorance of former ages, cherished by priests and tyrants in their own interests; man admitted the existence of God because, not yet advanced in science, he could not account for the astounding works of nature without, and the complicated operations of the mind within himself, but by supposing an Almighty power beyond the sphere of his senses. Were such language confined to the lecture-halls of a few professors we might be amused at its bombast. But philosophical errors, particularly in a point of such importance, always have their issues in practical life in the morals of individuals as well as of society. Moreover, atheism, though clad in the majestic garb of science, yet comes down condescendingly to the level of the common people to undeceive them of their superstitious fear and of belief in God, and to initiate them into the wisdom of the new gospel. Among all classes of society books and periodicals are spread tending to ridicule the belief in God; men of talent live, as it were, on propagating atheism, and seem to have made it their profession to root out the fear of God from the hearts of the rich and the poor; not a few institutions of learning, lower and higher, systematically train our youth to ignore or deny the Supreme Being, on which man, as its creature, is dependent. It is, therefore, necessary to show by all means the inconsistency of atheistical tenets, and to evidence with undeniable proofs this main truth of God's existence, fundamental to the scientific and the moral order.

However, before entering upon such a task, it is suitable first to inquire into the ways in which we acquire the idea of God and the conviction of His existence. The validity of the demonstration, by which we endeavor both to evince this truth and to refute the objections made against it, depends greatly on the preliminary inquiry as to the manner in which we arrive at the idea of God. We shall,

therefore, in this essay answer three questions : first, in what way is the existence of God knowable to man ? secondly, by what proofs does the theist demonstrate it ? thirdly, on what grounds does the atheist deny it ?

I. In what way is the Existence of God Knowable to Man ?

God being the purest spirit, the way in which philosophers think Him to be known to us is closely connected with their views on the mode in which immaterial objects are manifested to the human mind. The proofs, therefore, which they use to demonstrate His existence are not only different, as they hold different theories on the origin of ideas, but even scarcely intelligible, if not traced back in some way to psychology. For to see through the reasons why a supramundane being is to be admitted as the cause of the universe we must needs know how it reaches our mind, whether immediately by itself, or mediately through material beings, and, if the latter be the case, how the visible can lead or determine our intellect to the cognizance of the invisible. Now, there are at present various psychological systems more or less opposed to one another. It was not thus in the Middle Ages, when scholastic philosophy had its full sway in the schools, and the tenets regarding the origin of ideas were everywhere the same. Modern thinkers of the last two centuries, partly not knowing, partly despising ancient philosophy, gave rise to a multitude of psychological systems, each one of them becoming in turn the battlefield of fierce controversies. Consequently, if the existence of God was not altogether denied, different methods were attempted of treating of the Supreme Being. For this reason, whoever nowadays is about to demonstrate the existence of God, ought also to lay down the ideological tenets he follows, and thus to point out the principle from which he means to start, and the road by which he hopes to reach the goal. Nay, more, he must also show the deficiency of the methods opposed to his, not only because his own will be put in a clearer light, and its solidity be more apparent, if the falsity of those opposed to it is disclosed, but also because the attempts to prove the existence of God by arguments not solid and conclusive have given many advantages to atheists. Such unsound demonstrations they easily demolish, and then boast of having overthrown all the proofs advanced for the existence of a personal God, and of being unhurt by all the attacks of the theists. We should, therefore, reject what is really false and unsolid, and avow it to be so ; we should strive to put forth such reasons as are not founded on false or doubtful theories, but rest on certain principles, and are not at variance with experience, else we shall do harm to the cause of truth rather than

advance it. First, then, let us inquire in what way God's existence is not known to man, and then in what way it is.

In treating of false methods I shall confine myself to those only which are still at present followed, or at least supposed to be followed, either in the schools or outside of them. First of all is to be mentioned that of merely subjective impulse. It was invented by Reid. After David Hume had, by denying the objective value of rational cognition, established skepticism in its full extent, Reid would maintain at least the objective reality of the general principles of self, of the outside world, and of God. He granted that reason by itself could not prove their existence; but over it, as its regulator, and as the foundation of all certainty, he put common-sense, a faculty which reached and apprehended those fundamental truths, not by the comparison of ideas, nor by inference, nor by perceiving any reason of them, but by a merely subjective impulse which we cannot resist. Kant combined Hume's and Reid's tenets into one system. By his innate forms of the cognoscitive faculties he denied the veracity of the senses, the understanding, and the theoretical reason, and thus not less than Hume set forth universal skepticism. But feeling himself in opposition to the convictions of mankind, particularly in regard to the existence of God, he resorted to practical reason as a remedy for the shortcomings of his theory. Like Reid's common-sense, Kant's practical reason attains no evidence, reaches no insight into objective truth, but admits certain postulates, because they are forced on it by the subjective necessity of our nature. As to the existence of God, which is one of them, he reasons in the following way: Rational nature lays upon us the law of the moral order with absolute necessity, yet by its own authority and intrinsic constitution, not by receiving it through cognition from a higher power. In this life, however, the moral order can never be perfectly put into execution, since the sensible nature cannot be fully subjected to reason, nor can happiness be enjoyed in proportion to virtue. As reason, nevertheless, tells us that it ought to be so, we are forced to think that there must be a cause which shall realize our happiness and reduce nature to perfect harmony with morality. This cause, no doubt intelligent, we call God. It has often been said that this reasoning of the German Aristotle is of astounding depth, and far more solid than the proofs brought forward by other schoolmen. Atheists even quite willingly admit this, not because they are convinced by the argument, but because they can easily refute it and thus glory in a splendid victory. For both Kant's and Reid's way of establishing the truth of the existence of God is not tenable at all, because repugnant to rational nature and intrinsically contradictory. It is the very nature of all cognoscitive faculties to tend toward

apprehending their object, and not to rest or to adhere to it before they have perceived it in some respect as it is in itself. Every rational or intellectual faculty in particular is by its intrinsic constitution fitted to attain the essence of its objects and penetrate the reason of things, and therefore it cannot acquiesce in a truth except it perceives for the same an intrinsic or extrinsic reason, nor produce in us a certain and firm conviction except it presents us a motive to judge that our assent is true and cannot be false. Common-sense, therefore, of rational nature, which firmly adheres to certain judgments without seeing any reason for them, either by the comparison of ideas or by inference, and practical reason, which is forced to admit certain postulates without any intrinsic or extrinsic evidence of the object, involve contradiction in their very conceptions.

Kant, moreover, predicates the fallaciousness of theoretical reason on the ground that the forms of its cognitions result not from the object, but from the frame of the mind, and he adds that practical reason also is forced to assume certain postulates, among them the existence of God, not in virtue of an objective reason, but a merely subjective bent of the mind. Reid, too, grants both the insufficiency of reason left to itself to attain objective truth and its proneness to error and fallacy. But how is it possible that for the very subjective impulse, for which theoretical reason is unreliable, practical reason should be true? How can one faculty of rational nature be declared essentially deceitful, and the other, just for the reason that it belongs to our nature, be considered as infallible? In such systems, and consequently also in demonstration based on them, the preceding part destroys the following, and one tenet gainsays the other.

F. H. Jacobi, "the Sage of Pempelfort," tried to counteract Kant's philosophy, and to save from skepticism the reality of super-sensible objects, as: God, providence, free-will, immortality, and morality. Following quite a different way he supposes three faculties in man: the senses, the organ for the material; reason, the organ for the immaterial; understanding, which gives our perceptions their form and reduces them to unity. The understanding, he admits, with its dialectical procedure and its conclusions grounded on the principle of causality, cannot reach the divinity as distinct from the world, but must needs end in atheism and nihilism. But reason, he thinks, perceives the immaterial immediately or intuitively, and in an analogous way, as the senses perceive the material. It is, says he, merely passive in perceiving, since it only receives an impression from the object, and does by no means judge or draw conclusions. Its cognitions, therefore, resting on no ground or proof, are termed by him sometimes senti-

ments or feelings, sometimes mere belief. It would not have been necessary to mention Jacobi's philosophy of non-science, as he himself calls it, had he not had a good many followers, and were not modern mysticism, that makes of religion only a matter of feeling, to a great extent based on his tenets. From what we have said against Kant, the falsity of Jacobi's philosophical system is evident, for into Kantism he more or less falls back, however much he tries to refute it. He, too, declares onè faculty of our intellectual nature to be intrinsically fallacious; he, too, takes the conviction of reason for blind necessity, denying it any insight into objective truth and into the reason and causes of things, with only this difference, that Kant thinks the postulates of practical reason to result from the necessity of the subject, while Jacobi holds the axioms of reason to be blindly impressed on it by the necessity of the object. The blindness of his belief is well expressed by his saying that reason as well as the senses are in their perceptions merely passive; that is, merely perceiving an impression from the object. If that be so then there is no essential difference between cognition and the impression which a falling stone makes in the water; then cognition ceases to be an immanent act of the subject representing the object as it is in itself.

Plato showed greater genius when he taught God and immaterial objects in general to be known to man by innate ideas. Des Cartes and his school followed him in this regard, at least as far as God is concerned. Of this method I shall not speak in particular, since it is to be reduced to that of immediate intuition, and will, consequently, be refuted together with this. Des Cartes resorted to innate ideas because he thought the idea of the infinite could neither be impressed on our mind by finite and contingent beings, nor be gathered from them, since that which produces an idea or from which an idea may be gathered must contain the perfections of the object mentally represented. But nothing that is finite contains the perfections of what is infinite; consequently he concludes that God Himself stamps the idea of the infinite on our mind by the very act of creation.¹ Were it so God would also be the object immediately determining us to this idea. For, indeed, if what objectively determines the mind to it is finite, all his reasoning above is false, and he must allow that something finite may produce in us the idea of the infinite. Yet, what immediately and as an object determines our mind to a conception is also immediately or intuitively seen. According to Des Cartes's principles, therefore, God must be known to us by immediate intuition.² True,

¹ Des Cartes's school taught that the essence of the soul consisted in actual thought; many ontologists hold the same opinion.

² See F. Kleutgen, *Philosophie der Vorzeit*, II Band, n. 935-937, first edition.

he himself tried to take another way, but inconsistently. His disciples quite legitimately inferred the necessity of immediate intuition of God, and thus started a new system,—Ontologism.

According to the ontologists we see God intuitively as He is in Himself, and consequently also attain His existence, not by demonstration, but directly, though it be by reflexion on the intuitive act known more clearly and distinctly. For, as they say, by our direct intuition we are not cognizant of the divine essence, but either of the divine intellect containing the ideas of all things, or of God's creative act, or of the absolute and necessary being; and also this intuition is not granted to us separately from other acts, but is implied in our conceptions of finite beings, for which reason it is neither clear nor does it fall at first on our consciousness. However, they think to discover Him in our direct cognitions by a more careful reflection, and to obtain a distinct and determinate notion of His perfections by attention to the contingent beings that flow from Him as their source. Their assertions they base on the following reasons: that the material cannot produce in us the idea of the spiritual, as the finite cannot arouse the idea of the infinite; that the finite and the contingent are essentially relative to the infinite and the necessary, and therefore cannot be conceived without the notion of the two latter; that nothing can determine our mind to cognition but what exists, yet that the contingent is neither being nor existing by itself, and consequently cannot act on us by itself; that the universal, eternal, and necessary essences of finite beings are nothing in themselves, and not real, but in God, in His essence, omnipotence, and intellect; and are, consequently, not revealed to us but by Him; lastly, that God, being intimately present to us, determines our mind to His intuition.¹

The great advantage of this system, we are told, is the harmony

¹ The ontologists attribute to the scholastics, at least to those of modern times, the opinion once maintained by Des Cartes, that the immediate object we perceive by our direct acts is not the thing outside us, but its image or representation within the cognitive faculty. They likewise say that according to scholastic views the intellectual act is performed by the faculty or the subject alone without any concurrence of the object. For this reason they call their system ontologism, because, according to it, the object itself is seen by us, and term that of the scholastics psychologism, because, according to it, we directly perceive only a phenomenon of the mind. But in one assertion, as well as in the other, the ontologists are entirely wrong. The ideas or species are not that of which we are directly cognizant, but that by which we are cognizant of an outside object: non id, *quod*, sed id, *quo* cognoscimus. Their error seems to arise from their not distinguishing in scholastic writings between the idea considered objectively and the idea considered subjectively or formally, between the image itself and the object represented by it. The concurrence of the object with the subject to perform the cognitive act is taught by the scholastics, ancient and modern, in the clearest terms; they require, just on this account, the *species impressa* originating from the object.

it professes to establish between the ontological and the psychological order; the derivation of all things from their supreme principle by the synthetic method, the contemplation of all truth in the divine, increate light. Indeed, very lofty ideas seem at first sight to be embodied in these theories. Yet the question is, whether they rest on sound principles and can be proved by solid reasons. This, however, must be denied, for ontologism is repugnant to human nature and to experience.¹

The nature of man being one, his operation also must be reduced to unity. On this account must not only the lower faculties of the senses be subordinate to the higher, to the intellect and the will, but also the latter depend on the former as their necessary instruments. Consequently the intellect draws its first conceptions from objects perceived and thus presented to it by the senses, and analogically with them forms ideas of the immaterial. Again, the immediate object of our cognition must be proportioned to the nature of our intellect, and therefore, as this is the faculty of a soul united to a body, the intelligible truth of matter must first and directly be known to us. St. Thomas² expounds and proves this fundamental tenet of scholastic philosophy again and again, but particularly in the eighty-fifth question of the first part of the *Summa Theologica*. Having laid down as a principle that the knowable object must be proportioned to the cognitive faculty, he infers, first, that for the senses, since they are bodily organs, the proper objects are the forms individually existing in matter, as they

¹ On ontologism, its tenets, its intrinsic repugnance, its condemnation by the Holy See, Father Kleutgen, S. J., has written a very learned and interesting treatise. It was first (in 1867) published in *Der Katholik*, of Mentz, and later added as a supplement to his renowned work on ancient philosophy. Many of our remarks are taken from thence.

² *Summa Theolog.*, i., p. 9, 85, art. 1. Respondeo dicendum, quod, sicut supradictum est, 9, 80, art. 2, et 9, 84, art. 7, objectum cognoscibile proportionatur virtuti cognoscitivæ. Est autem triplex gradus cognoscitivæ virtutis. Quædam enim cognoscitiva virtus est actus organi corporalis, scilicet sensus; et ideo objectum cuiuslibet sensitivæ potentiæ est forma prout in materia existit. Et quia huiusmodi materia est individuationis principium, ideo omnis potentia sensitivæ partis est cognoscitiva particularium tantum. Quædam autem virtus cognoscitiva est, quæ neque est actus organi corporalis, neque est aliquo modo corporali materiæ conjuncta, sicut intellectus angelicus; et huius virtutis cognoscitivæ objectum est forma sine materia subsistens. Etsi enim materialia cognoscant, non tamen nisi in immaterialibus ea intuentur, vel in se ipsis, vel in Deo. Intellectus autem humanus medio modo se habet; non enim est actus alicuius organi, sed tamen est quædam virtus animæ, quæ est forma corporis, et ex supradictis patet (9 F. 6, art. 1), et ideo proprium ejus est cognoscere formam in materia quidem corporali individualiter existens, non tamen prout est in tali materia. Cognoscere vero id, quod est in materia individuali, non prout est in tali materia, est abstrahere formam a materia individuali, quam repræsentant phantasmata. Et ideo necesse est dicere, quod intellectus noster intelligit materialia abstrahendo a phantasmatibus; et per materialia sic considerata in immaterialium aliquam cognitionem devenimus; sicut e contra Angeli per immaterialia materialia cognoscunt.

individually exist in it; then, that the angels, being pure spirits, and not united to a body, have for their proper object the immaterial, and see in or through it the material; last, that the human intellect, being the faculty of a soul embodied in matter, knows as its proper object the forms individually existing in matter, though not as they individually exist in it, and is cognizant of the immaterial only from the material. "The human intellect," says he, "is the faculty of a soul, which is the form of a body. Therefore it is peculiar to it to be cognizant of the form individually existing in matter, though not in the manner in which it individually exists in the same." After having remarked that such cognition is achieved by abstracting the form from individual matter as represented by the acts or images of our fancy, he concludes: "And, therefore, we must needs say that our intellect is cognizant of material objects by abstracting (their forms) from the images of fancy, and that from the material thus conceived it attains some knowledge of the immaterial, as on the contrary the angels know the material from the immaterial."

This dependence of the intellect on the senses, and on the fancy in particular and proximately, here inferred from the union of our soul with the body, St. Thomas elsewhere confirms from facts and instances of daily experience.¹ First, if our organs of sensation are not developed, or are hurt or hindered in their activity, the intellect also is prevented from action, so as to be unable to acquire new notions, or even to make use of those already acquired. Yet the intellect is no organic faculty. The reason, then, why, the senses being inactive, intellectual activity is impeded too, can lie only in its dependence on the sensitive operations. Again, if we strive to understand something, we form images of it by our fancy in order to see in them as in resemblances what we endeavor to know intellectu-

¹ S. Th., p. i., 9, 84, art. 7. Respondeo dicendum, quod impossibile est intellectum nostrum secundum præsentis vitæ statum, quo passibili corpori conjungitur, aliquid intelligere in actu, nisi convertendo se ad phantasmata. Et hoc duobis indiciis appareat. Primo quidem, quia cum intellectus sit vis quedam non utens corporali organo, nullo modo impediretur in suo actu per læsionem alicuius corporalis organi, si non requireretur ad eius actum actus alicuius potentiæ utentis organo corporali. Utuntur autem organo corporali sensus et imaginatio et aliæ vires pertinentes ad partem sensitivam. Unde manifestum est, quod ad hoc, quod intellectus actu intelligat, non solum scientiam accipiendo de novo, sed etiam utendo scientia jam acquisita, requiritur actus imaginationis et ceterarum virtutum. Videmus enim quod impedito actu virtutis imaginativæ per læsionem organi ut in phreneticis, et similiter impedito actu memorativæ virtutis, ut in lethargicis, impeditur homo ab intelligendo in actu etiam ea, quorum scientiam præacceperit.

Secundo, quia hoc quilibet in se ipso experiri potest, quod quando aliquis conatur aliquid intelligere, format sibi aliqua phantasmata per modum exemplorum, in quibus quasi inspicit quod intelligere studet. Et inde est etiam, quod quando aliquem volumus facere aliquid intelligere, proponimus ei exempla, ex quibus sibi phantasmata formare possit ad intelligendum. See also S. Th., p. i., 9, 84, art. 8.

ally. For the same reason, if we intend to make somebody understand a truth, we propose him examples, from which we may form images in his fancy. A striking illustration, indeed, of how the intellect needs the help of the senses, and contemplates the immaterial through the likeness of the material.

From these premises the impossibility of the immediate intuition of God follows evidently. God is the purest spirit, most remote from all materiality, infinitely perfect and sublime as to his essence and attributes; consequently, he is also least proportioned to our intellect and least knowable to our minds by immediate cognition. St. Thomas, in fact, having proved in general that no rational creature can see God intuitively by the natural power of the intellect, there being no proportion between a finite faculty and an infinite object,¹ still shows in particular man's incapability of attaining the intuition of the Divinity during this life, because the human soul, being united to a material body, naturally cannot know anything but the forms of matter and what may be deduced from these.² Ontologism is directly opposed to all these tenets and principles. It destroys man's unity in nature and in operation, as Plato, from whom it originates, once had done; it does not accord our activity to our nature or proportion the object of our cognition to our being; it makes no longer of the lower faculties the necessary instruments of the higher, and denies the dependence of the intellect on the senses; for, according to its theories, not from the senses does the intellect receive its peculiar object, but from the infinite being itself, and not from the sensible objects does it know the supersensible, but, on the contrary, through the light of the supersensible it understands the sensible, and from the immaterial the material. It is on such suppositions and by such assertions that the ontologism arrives at the necessity of the immediate intuition of God.

That this intuition does not exist in our mind we can prove, not only from the nature of man, as we have just done, but also from our own consciousness. The proof may be reduced to the following terms. If we saw God intuitively, we should be conscious of our seeing Him so. But we have no such consciousness; consequently we do not see God intuitively. But why should we be

¹ S. Th., p. i., 9, 12, art. 4.

² S. Th., p. i., 9, 12, art. 11. Respondeo dicendum, quod ab homine puro Deus videri per essentiam non potest, nisi ab hac vita mortali separetur. Cujus ratio est, quia, sicut supra dictum est, art. 4 hujus quæstionis, modus cognitionis sequitur modum naturæ rei cognoscentis. Anima autem nostra, quamdiu in hac vita vivimus, habet esse in materia corporali, unde actualiter non cognoscit aliqua, nisi quæ habent formam in materia, vel quæ per huiusmodi cognosci possunt. Manifestum est autem quod per naturas rerum naturalium divina essentia cognosci (*videri*) non potest. Ostensum est enim supra art. 1 et 9 hujus quæstionis, quod cognitio Dei per quamcunque similitudinem creatam non est visio essentiæ ipsius. Unde impossibile est animæ hominis secundum hanc vitam viventis essentiam Dei videre.

conscious of the intuition of God if we really enjoyed it? Because we may be conscious of any distinct act or cognition of our mind, at least if we try to call our attention upon it; generally we are conscious of it without or even against our will. Thus, no doubt, we have a very clear consciousness of our cognitive acts regarding sensible objects. We ought, consequently, also to be conscious of our seeing God intuitively, and the more so, if, as the ontologists say, in this light we see all other objects, they having intelligibility not in themselves, but in God. For if this be so, then the Divine Being is that which first and chiefly strikes our intellect, which is first and most clearly known to us; it is the source from which all other objects flow, and from which, if they are not seen flowing, they are not knowable at all. Therefore, if the immediate intuition of God were granted to us, we should be conscious of it more distinctly than of any other cognizance; we should be aware of it as the clearest, the most certain cognition we have, as the light and the source of all our knowledge. Yet we are not conscious of having such a cognition of God. The ontologists themselves grant it when they take refuge in habitual intuition; for by habitual intuition they understand one that is perpetually as an act in our mind, but escapes our consciousness. In reality man is not conscious of knowing God more clearly than sensible objects, and of having a fuller evidence of His existence than of his own self and this material world, else there would be no atheism and no gross errors about the Supreme Being; he does not inquire into the properties of matter by contemplating the Divinity, but, on the contrary, illustrates spiritual and divine truth by similitudes taken from material things; he does not form an immediate judgment that this world takes existence from God by creation, but finds its true origin only by reasoning. These facts, undeniably true and real, show that we are not conscious of the intuition of God, and that consequently we have no such intuition.

Its not existing in our minds is also proved from another fact. Certainly nobody on earth will say that he is perfectly happy. But the intuitive cognition of God necessarily produces full bliss and happiness in the soul. God by his intimate presence immediately determining us to his intuition, fills our intellect with His infinite truth, and our will with His infinite goodness, as much as they are capable of, and in the most perfect way. In this consists the happiness of a rational creature. Since, then, we do not enjoy complete happiness during this life, it follows that we have no immediate intuition of God.¹

¹ These two reasons are alleged also by St. Thomas against those who in or before his times thought, like the ontologists, that God is the first object of our cognition as He is the First Being and the Supreme Cause. He says: *Quidam dixerunt, quod*

Here, however, we meet with serious objections on the part of the ontologists. Our natural intuition of God, say they, is not a clear one, nor do we during this life see the divine essence, but we see only His creative act, or His idea, or the absolutely necessary being, which, though it is God, yet is not known to us to be God directly and immediately. Indeed, they have very good reasons to make exceptions, since here not only a fact of experience but also a dogma of faith comes into the question. It is necessary to say a few words for the solution of this objection. The very idea of immediate intuition excludes obscurity. In general of all cognitions those are the clearest which are immediate or intuitive, because they result from the influence of the object itself on the cognitive faculty, and, therefore, most distinctly represent it as it is in itself. Obscurity may arise in our cognitions from two causes; either from the insufficient presence of the object to the faculty, or from the circumstance that we have to deduce the conception of one thing from another, in which it is not adequately contained or manifested. From the latter cause the intuition of God, as taught by the ontologists, cannot be obscure; for it is immediate. Neither can insufficient presence cause obscurity in it; for God is, as the ontologists fully agree and constantly repeat, intimately present to our soul, and by conserving and supporting our being constantly acts on us. Now if His presence determines our mind to intuition, our intellect is entirely pervaded with its fulness of objective light, with the light of the Divinity itself, and must, consequently, see the latter with the greatest clearness. This being so, it is also evident that whoever sees God immediately, intuitively and clearly knows also His essence, and that whoever by cognition is cognizant of the absolute and necessary being, directly perceives it also to be God. For, on account of His absolute and complete simplicity, there is in God no real distinction and composition whatsoever; His acts and His absolute attributes are His essence itself. If, therefore, God exhibits Himself to our mind immediately, not under the shade of figures and creatures, and consequently as He is in Himself, we cannot see His ideas or His creative act without seeing His essence, nor His absolute being without seeing His Godhead; we must, on the contrary, by the very act of immediate

primum, quod a mente humana cognoscitur, etiam in hac vita est Deus, qui est prima veritas, et per hanc omnia alia cognoscuntur. Sed hoc aperte est falsum: quia cognoscere Deum per essentiam, est hominis beatitudo, unde sequeretur omnem hominem beatum esse. Et præterea cum in divina essentia omnia, quæ dicuntur de ipsa, sint unum, nullus erraret circa ea, quæ de Deo dicuntur, quod experimento patet esse falsum: et iterum ea, quæ sunt prima in cognitione intellectus, oportet esse certissima, unde intellectus certus est, se ea intelligere, quod patet in proposito non esse. Opusc. 70. Super Boeth. de Trin., 9, 1, art. 3.

intuition know His wisdom, His power, and His absolute necessity to be His Divinity.

Moreover, according to the ontologists, we know God intuitively as far as He is the light and intelligibility of all knowable objects, the source of all finite essences, the cause of all existences, the absolute and necessary being. Yet we cannot know Him thus without seeing clearly and penetrating His essence. For the essence of God consists in His absolute necessity, or in His infinite perfection; but by His absolute necessity He is the last cause of contingent existences, and by His infinite perfection the source of all finite essences, of all being, and thus, also, of all intelligibility. Consequently, if we see in God, what the ontologists tell us we do, we must see His essence; and clearly and penetratingly too, because we know it as eminently containing all things in the infinite abundance of its perfection and constituting them in their essence and their existence.

But what shall we say about the reasons which the ontologists advance for their system? The two principal ones we shall consider soon, the others in the course of our discussion as occasion shall offer. First we heard them say that what is contingent has being and existence not by itself but by God, since the being of an object is its intelligibility. No doubt contingent beings have their existence not from themselves, but from the creative act of God. Yet if they are once created they have being and existence distinct from God, though still sustained and supported by His almighty power, for were they not distinct from God they would be divine, which is sheer pantheism. Having their own entity and existence distinct from that of any other being, and also of God, they have also their own intelligibility and their own power to act on our senses and to awaken through them our intellect. It is, for this reason, utterly false that contingent beings are not intelligible in themselves, but only in God. True, they always have an essential relation to God as their last cause and source; but our intellect being finite and imperfect, is not at once cognizant of all that is knowable of an object, but knows one of its properties after the other. Thus we know many a thing first as to its being considered in itself, and then as to its dependence on a cause which produces it. Yet, again, of this efficient cause we do not instantly know the specific nature, but find it after further reflection and inquisition. In the same way man may have a notion of beings which are contingent without being aware that they are contingent; and, again, after some reasoning he may discover that they are such, and consequently dependent on a cause, without yet knowing that they imply dependence on an infinite cause. If the ontologists insist on the non-intelligibility of the contingent, they must also deny

its own being and its distinction from God. This is one of the reasons why their system has been justly accused of containing the germs of pantheism.

The other reason, alleged as a chief support of ontologism, is the following: Whenever we think of an existing contingent being, we perceive in it an essence universal, eternal, necessary, and immutable. Now this essence is on the one hand no fiction of the mind, but real and, therefore, existing, and yet on the other hand cannot exist in the contingent beings themselves, they being as to their existence individual, temporal, not necessary, and mutable. Where, then, can such essences exist and from where may they be understood? In God alone, it is answered; because He alone is necessary, eternal, and immutable. Two very important tenets of ontologism seem thus to be well founded: the first is, that we cannot know any contingent being intellectually or as to its essence but in God; the second is, that the universals (the essences common to many individuals and predicable of many) are, as far as they are real, God Himself. What is to be said in reply to this objection? The metaphysical essences are, no doubt, no fiction of the mind, but have their objective reality. Yet it must be denied that whatever is real exists in itself. That also is real which is contained in or founded on an existing being; for most certainly what is such, though it does not yet exist in itself, is no product of our mind or our abstractions. Now the finite essences are really contained in the contingent that exists; for they are made actual and embodied, as it were, in it, just as the model is expressed in the statue carved after it. For this reason we can conceive the finite essences in and from contingent beings that exist, though, in order to have them universal and necessary, we must abstract them from the individual properties and accidental notes with which they are joined, and from the temporal existence which they have in the concrete. However, the existent beings, which we directly perceive, are not the last ground of these essences for the reason mentioned above, that the latter are eternal and necessary, whereas the former are contingent and temporal. What, then, may be this ground? No doubt a necessary, eternal, immutable, self-existing being. It is not, however, necessary that they themselves exist as such a being; it is only required that an absolute being exists, which is necessarily their foundation. The divine essence being participable and imitable outside itself is in reality, and on account of its being the only absolute, infinite, and self-existent being can also alone be the reason of them all. Nevertheless, in saying so we evidently differ from the ontologists. We firmly maintain that God's infinite essence is the last foundation of all finite essences; yet we do not say, as the ontologists do, but, on the contrary, most explicitly, deny that

He is Himself the universal, necessary, and eternal essences of finite things, and that there is between Him and them no real distinction. This we must disavow; first, because else the universal would exist as such, which is absurd, and secondly, because, if God Himself were the finite essences as far as they are real, His simple and indivisible essence would also be in the finite beings as their essence, and we should say both God is humanity and materiality and humanity and materiality are God. But are these not pantheistic errors? Here we have another reason why ontologism is considered as leading to pantheism.

If nevertheless the authority of St. Thomas is appealed to, because he sometimes with St. Augustine calls God the light in which we know all things, it is not difficult to infer from his own words a meaning quite contrary to the teachings of the ontologists. He himself explains his mind at least in four different places of the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, where he discusses the question how God is the light of all our knowledge.¹ We know all things, he repeatedly inculcates, in the light of the first truth, not because God is the first object of which we are cognizant, but because our intellectual light, that is our intellectual power, is a participation of His intellect and created by Him to the imitation of the divine intellect.

After all, then, the method of the ontologists in evidencing the existence of God cannot be considered as solid and safe. Though it may have put on a scientific appearance, and it may be highly praised by its admirers as the only true philosophical system and the only sure way of refuting atheism, its very foundation is a mere fiction. There is no immediate intuition of God granted to us during this life; the unity and the finiteness of human nature reject it, our own consciousness testifies against it, the reasons alleged for it are not only not tenable, but, on the contrary, imply pantheism.²

¹ 9, 12, art. 2 et 11 ad 3; 9, 84, art. 5; 9, 88, art. 3 ad 1.

² It is claimed that, though ontologism has been condemned by the Holy See, yet not every form of it has been condemned. We must, therefore, consider in what way this condemnation was brought about. In 1861 the Congregation of the Roman Inquisition censured seven propositions as being such as could not be taught safely. I shall mention the first and the third. I. *Propositio*. *Immediata Dei cognitio, habitualis saltem, intellectui humano essentialis est, ita ut sine ea nihil cognoscere possit, siquidem est ipsum lumen intellectuale.* The immediate cognition of God, at least that which is habitual, is essential to the human intellect, so that without such cognition it cannot know anything at all, this cognition being the very intellectual light. III. *Propositio*. *Universalia a parte rei considerata a Deo realiter non distinguuntur.* The universals considered in their reality are not really distinct from God. The ontologists, then pretty numerous in France, generally thought that this condemnation was aimed at German pantheism. However, L. B. S. Brancheran, S. S., before publishing a new edition of his work, *Prælectiones philosophicæ in majori Seminaris Claromontensis primo habitæ*, deemed it prudent to ask the competent authority about the bearing of the said condemnation. Accordingly he condensed his system of ontologism into

From the principles and tenets laid down thus far it will now not be difficult to determine in what way God is knowable to man. As the object directly proportioned to human nature is the essence of sensible things, and as our intellect in general gathers the knowledge of the immaterial from the material, we cannot know God but from

fifteen propositions, and through the Archbishop of Tours and the Bishop of Nantes put the question to the Holy See whether they were or not implied in the seven propositions condemned in 1861. Cardinal Patrizi, then Secretary of the Congregation of the Inquisition, in 1862, replied to the Bishop of Nantes that the fifteen propositions in question scarcely differed from the seven already condemned and ought to be taught no longer, a decision to which L. Brancheran submitted with exemplary humility and obedience, and to the greatest satisfaction of the Holy See. In 1866 the Congregation of the Inquisition and the Index published a decree, approved by the Sovereign Pontiff, by which the works of G. C. Ubaghs, professor at the University of Louvain, a renowned ontologist, were condemned, because they contained teachings quite similar to some of those seven propositions. Mgr. Hugouin, before being promoted to the episcopal See of Bageuz, was urged by the Pope through the Nuncio at Paris to recant the opinions he had espoused in his work, *Etudes philosophiques*, and to promise to take care that they should not be taught in the schools any longer. The bishop-elect complied with the wishes of the Pope, and in 1866 published a declaration, in which he says that the opinions of his disapproved by the Holy See were his views on ontologism, because favorable to the seven propositions condemned in 1861. (See the documents in the *Revue de Sciences Ecclesiastiques*, 1866, Août; in *Der Katholik* of Mentz, October, 1866; in F. Kleutgen's *Treatise on Ontologism*, pages 15-20.)

From all this it is evident that in the seven propositions censured by the Holy See ontologism is concerned; and that the views of the French ontologists as to the immediate cognition of God and as to the universal essences were implied in them. Any other form, then, of ontologism, to which the first and the third of those seven propositions are also fundamental, we should infer, is likewise disapproved by the Holy See. Gioberti in particular, whose doctrines, if we are to believe Dr. Brownson, are not hit by the said decree of the Inquisition, requires the immediate intuition of God not less than the French authors mentioned above, though he does not advance for his assertion quite the same reasons. He thinks man cannot know anything but by immediately seeing God as he creates the contingent existences, and teaches that this first principle, "*ens creat existentias*," is known to us from the very beginning of our intellectual life, and is the light and the source of all knowledge in the ideal as well as in the real order. Then he denies that the finite and the contingent have an entity and intelligibility of their own, and says accordingly that they are only secondary and relative substances, supported by the first cause, and simple abstractions or modifications of the same; that they are individualizations and determinations of the absolute; that creation is not the production of a being out of nothing, but the production of modes in the absolute by the independent power of the latter; that the absolute is first vaguely conceived by us, but by reflection limited, determined and endowed with finite unity. There is indeed no form of ontologism so akin to pantheism as that of Gioberti's. Should this censure appear too severe to anybody, I appeal to his own letter, *Demopito alla govine Italia*, in which he openly proclaims pantheism as the only solid philosophy. What the Holy See thought of Gioberti's system may be learned from the decree by which all his writings were put in the *Index Librorum prohibitorum*. Dr. Brownson, to some extent, adopts and defends Gioberti's ontologism in several articles of the last series of his *Review*, particularly in his *Refutation of Atheism, Ontologism, and Psychologism*, and of F. Hill's *Philosophy*; all that he says tends towards proving the two propositions: "*Immediata Dei cognitio, habitualis saltem, intellectui humano essentialis est, ita ut sine ea nihil cognoscere possit, siquidem, est ipsum lumen intellectuale*," and "*Universalia a parte rei considerata a Deo realiter non distinguuntur*."

beings perceived by the senses. This inference St. Thomas draws very explicitly in the 88th question (art. 3) of the *Summa Theologica*. The human intellect, says he, owing to the condition of this life, cannot immediately know the created immaterial substances, and much less the essence of the increated substance. For this reason God is not the object of which we are first cognizant, but is known to us from creatures, and as the object directly proportioned to our intellect is the material, he is known to us particularly from the beings of this material and sensible world. The truth of this conclusion he confirms by the words of St. Paul (Rom. i. 20): "The invisible things of Him (God) from the creation of the world are clearly seen."¹

But how can the invisible be gathered from the visible and the infinite from the finite? To answer this difficulty, I invite the reader to a careful consideration of the following remarks: Perceiving objects presented to us by the senses, we first form a notion of their essence and thus conceive them as beings; for in reality they are beings and can, after having acted on our senses, be apprehended as such. Indeed, if our intellect were not capable of such cognition, what object could be proportioned to it? By further reflection we understand those beings to be produced, because we see them come into existence; contingent, because they are temporal; finite, not because they appear below the infinite, but because among them one is inferior to the other in perfection, and even the highest of them can still be conceived as perfectible and deficient in many regards. Then, from the contingent, that is the being, which can exist and not exist, we form the idea of the necessary by denying the possibility of non-existence; from the produced, the idea of the unproduced by denying production; from the finite, the idea of the infinite by denying all limits of perfection. Moreover, considering that the contingent and produced beings, which exist, require a cause which is not produced and contingent, we conceive the last cause to be the necessary and unproduced being and, therefore, of a quite different and much higher nature than the effects; and knowing that the perfection of the effect must pre-exist in the cause, we infer the last and universal cause to possess all the real and possible perfections of the universe, though not divided and

¹ S. Th., p. i., 9, 88, art. 3: Respondeo dicendum, quod cum intellectus humanus secundum statum presentis vitæ non possit intelligere substantias immateriales creatas, ut dictum est art. præc., multo minus potest intelligere essentiam substantiæ increatæ. Unde simpliciter dicendum est, quod Deus non est primum, quod a nobis cognoscitur, sed magis per creaturas in Dei cognitionem pervenimus, secundum illud Apostoli ad Rom. i. 20: Invisibilia Dei per ea, quæ facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur. Primum autem, quod intelligitur a nobis secundum statum presentis vitæ, est quidditas rei materialis, quæ est nostri intellectus objectum ut multoties supra dictum est 9, 84, art. 7 et 85, art. 1 et 87, art. 2 ad 2.

distinct from one another, but reduced to perfect unity and simplicity, and existing in it in a higher and eminent manner according to its superior nature. This is the threefold way of causality, remotion, and eminence, by which St. Thomas says we rise from the creature to the Creator. By the way of inference from the principle of causality we know Him to exist; by the remotion or negation of all the limits, dependence, or imperfections of the creature we conceive Him as independent, infinite, unproduced, self-existent; by exalting Him on this account over all His works, we understand that whatever perfection may be conceived from the world, as being, life, wisdom, goodness, power, beauty, is in Him in an eminent degree.¹ However, this cognition of God, as St. Thomas repeatedly remarks, is analogical and imperfect. Analogical it is, because we attribute to Him the perfections we gather from the sensible works of His power, though cleared from all limitation, and thus conceive Him from the entity, which the effect has in common with its last cause, or, in other words, from the similitude which the creature has with its Maker. Imperfect is the knowledge of Him, because, though we distinguish Him by it from any other being, still it does not fully manifest Him to us as He is in Himself. For as all the effects He produced in the universe cannot equal the infinite cause, He does not and cannot reveal all His excellence by His works. Even such perfections as are perceived by us from them, cannot be transferred to Him as his peculiar attributes but by denying the limits they have in the creatures, and thus we know Him rather by conceiving what He is not than by conceiving what He is.²

From the visible world, therefore, we can really gain the knowledge of its invisible Creator, though not one by which we see Him clearly and in the fulness of His perfections, but one by which we understand His essence only inadequately and with much obscurity, and contemplate Him, not directly as He is in Himself absolutely simple and infinite, but indirectly as far as His image is faintly reflected from the multitude of His works both unequal to Him and representing His perfections one distinct from the other. We ought, therefore, to say, not that the finite cannot produce in us an idea of the infinite, but that it cannot give us an intuitive insight into the infinite and reveal it to us as it is in itself absolutely simple and yet infinitely perfect. This St. Thomas and all the scholastics after him taught and most forcibly insisted upon.³

It is now necessary to call the attention of the reader to the

¹ S. Th., p. i, 9, 12, art. 12; 9, 13, art. 1, art. 8 ad 2, art. 10 ad 5.

² S. Th., p. i, 9, 12, art. 12. See also Cardinal Franzelin, S. J., *De Deo Uno*, sect. ii., page 154.

³ S. Theol., p. i, 9, 12, art. 11. *Summa c. Gentis*, bib. iii, cap. 49.

particular manner in which we perceive the perfections of sensible objects. Whenever they strike our senses we form by the intellect an idea of their essences, and of the essences of their properties and their attributes. It is thus that we acquire the conceptions, for instance, of being, of action, of power, of order, of wisdom, of virtue, of necessity, of freedom. Now all such essences are abstract for a twofold reason. First, we have abstracted them either from any subject at all, or at least from any individual and determinate subject, and thus they become universal and predicable of many; of the contingent and the absolute, the finite and the infinite, provided they do not involve a limitation in their very conception. Secondly, we have abstracted them also from physical existence so as neither to include it in them nor to exclude it from them, on which account they belong to the metaphysical order and can be predicated of the possible as well as the existent. The essence of beauty, for instance, is neither something that as such individually exists, nor something that is merely possible; and, therefore, by conceiving it we do not know at all whether there is something beautiful actually existing in nature or not. It is of importance to observe that we conceive God and his attributes by such abstract notions drawn from sensible beings; for this will be decisive in the question how His existence is to be demonstrated.

The cognoscibility of God from the visible objects of this world granted, two ways have been proposed to evidence His existence. St. Anselm,¹ and after him several philosophers, among them Des Cartes and Leibnitz, tried to show it by a simple analysis of the idea of God, and for this reason affirmed it to be self-evident, or known by the mere comparison of the two notions: God and existence. We think God, say they, to be the most perfect or infinite and absolutely necessary being. But infinity and absolute necessity include existence in their very essence or conceptions. It seems, therefore, that the existence of God can be proved from the idea we have of him; or, as others say, *a priori* or *a simultaneo*. St. Thomas and his school have always rejected this proof as insufficient. He allows that God's essence involves His existence, or, rather, is in reality identical with it, but denies that we can attain it so as directly and without demonstration to see real existence contained in it. And why? Because we do not see God immediately, and by ideas drawn from His entity, but we think of Him by conceptions gathered from the creatures, made universal by abstraction, and then applied to Him, after having been purified, as it were, by the exclusion of all limits and all imperfections. However such abstract conceptions, as I said above, do not in-

¹ Froslog., c. 2.

volve physical or actual existence, but are abstracted from it; and, consequently, we conceive the essence of God without perceiving Him as actually existing. But it is objected that infinity and absolute necessity, which constitute His essence, also, according to our conception, include existence. No doubt they do, but that existence again belongs to the metaphysical, not to the physical order; or, in other words, it is ideal, not actual. For existence may be conceived in a twofold way: in the abstract, so that we only know its nature or its quiddity; in the concrete, so that we perceive something as actually existent in the universe.¹

Since, then, we do not directly know God as He is in Himself, neither by intuition nor by drawing from His creatures a concrete and proper, that is, not an analogical idea of Him, we cannot prove His essence *a priori*, or from His very essence. There remains, therefore, nothing else than to demonstrate it from the effects He produces in this visible world. Such is always the procedure of our cognizance. What we do not know of a being from its essence or in general from its causes, intrinsic or extrinsic, we must learn from its operations. St. Thomas very distinctly points out this way as the most appropriate to demonstrate the existence of God, after he had rejected St. Anselm's proof, and in general any evidence of the same by the analysis of His essence. There are, says he,² two ways of demonstration: one from the cause of a thing; and the other from its effects. From the latter we demonstrate the existence of their cause; for as the effect is dependent on and produced by the cause, it cannot exist, the cause not pre-existing. We have to make use of the demonstration *a priori*, whenever the effects are better known to us than the cause. This is really so in regard to God. For His essence, the intrinsic cause, is not attained by us by a conception involving actual existence, and on extrinsic causes He is not dependent at all. On the contrary, the effects He has produced in this material world are proportioned to our cognitive faculties and can be perceived by us directly and immediately. Consequently we can prove His existence only from the effects wrought by Him. This reasoning shows both the sole way of demonstrating this truth and the validity of such demonstration.

¹ Summa Theol., p. i., 9, 2, art. 1.; S. e. Gentes, lib. i., lip. xi.; Quæst. disp. de Veritate, 9, 10, art. 12; Kleutgen, Philosophie der Vorzeit, I Band, n. 93, F. 943.

² Summa Theol., p. i., 9, 2, art. 2. Respondeo dicendum, quod duplex est demonstratio. Una quæ est *propter quid*, et hæc est per priora simpliciter; alia est per effectum et dicitur demonstratio *quia* et hæc per ea, quæ sunt priora quoad nos. Cum enim effectus aliquis nobis est manifestior sua causa, per effectum procedimus ad cognitionem causæ. Ex quolibet autem effectu potest demonstrari propriam eius causam esse, si tamen eius effectus sint magis noti quoad nos; quia cum effectus dependent a causa, posito effectu, necesse est causam præexistere. Unde Deum esse secundum quod non est per se notum quoad nos, demonstrabile est per effectus nobis notos.

The method of gathering the knowledge of God from this visible world and of inferring His existence from His works, is not only approved of by Sacred Scripture, but also recommended as quite convincing. "That," says St. Paul (Romans i., 19-21), "which is known of God is manifested in them (the Gentiles); for God has manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made: His eternal power also and divinity, so that they are inexcusable." In the Book of Wisdom (xiii. 1-6) we read, "But all men are vain, in whom there is not the knowledge of God, and who by these good things that are seen could not understand Him, that is, neither by attending to the works have acknowledged who is the workman; but have imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the great water, or the sun and moon to be the gods that rule the world. With whose beauty if they being delighted, took them to be gods: let them know how much the Lord of them is more beautiful than they; for the first Author of beauty made all those things. Or, if they admired their power and their effects, let them understand by them that He that made them is mightier than they. For by the greatness of the beauty and of the creature the Creator of them may be seen so as to be known thereby." The apostle, in general, points out the way of knowing God, His divinity (essence), power, and eternity, which he calls invisible, either because they are not perceived by our senses, or because they cannot be seen intuitively by the natural power of our intellect. Even to the Gentiles, says he, who had no supernatural revelation, they have become knowable from the creatures of this world, and have in this way been manifested to them so clearly that their idolatry or ignorance of the true God is inexcusable. More particularly we are told in the Book of Wisdom how man ought to have been cognizant both of God's existence and His infinite perfections. From the good things which they have seen, the heathen should have understood Him that is (τὸν ὄντα), the absolute being; from the works they attended to they should have acknowledged Him who effected them; from the beauty of the elements, the sun, the moon, and the stars, with which they were so much delighted as to take them for Gods, they should have inferred how much more beautiful than they the Lord, the author of all beauty, must be; from the power of the earthly and heavenly bodies, which they admired, they should have known that the Maker of them is still mightier; for, it is added at last, as a general axiom, from the greatness of the beauty and of the creature, the Creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby. This last clause is in the Greek text expressed by the simple adverb ἀναλόγως, which the Vulgate translates with *cognos-*

cibilibiter, but is rendered still more exactly by *consequenter*, or *concludendo*, or *analogice*, so that the sense of the whole phrase is: From the greatness of the beauty and the creatures, the Creator of them may be known by inference or analogically.¹

Having seen that the existence of God can be known to us neither by a blind subjective impulse, as Reid and Kant thought, nor by a blind impression on the part of the object on our reason, as Jacobi imagined, nor by immediate intuition, as the ontologists teach, nor by the analysis of the conception we have of Him, as it seems to those who admit the ontological proof *ab idea*, but that, on the contrary, it is evidenced only by demonstration *a posteriori*, or *ab effectu*, we shall in another article discuss the second question, to wit: By what proof is it demonstrated by the theists?

(To be continued.)

LORD BEACONSFIELD AND HIS LATEST NOVEL.

Endymion. By the author of "Lothair."

The Young Duke; Vivian Grey; Coningsby, etc. By the same author.

HALF a century ago Mr. Disraeli began his political career by being a novelist who dabbled in statesmanship. He ends by being a statesman who dabbles in novels. All his stories, from *Vivian Grey* to *Endymion*, were written with a view to statesmanship. At least they were so intended; and very grandiloquent were some of the author's early announcements regarding the merit of his works. These it would be ungenerous to recall, though probably no man to-day would laugh more heartily at such youthful ebullitions than the aged and wary statesman who has lived to achieve more than even the wildest of his heroes ever dreamed of achieving. In all his novels he had a purpose, and novels with purpose generally fail. The purpose is apt to be too much for the story. Those who wish to hear a sermon will go to church; or a policy defined and defended will go to the senate. In a novel they look for love, adventure, humor, the delineation of character. To trace up the tangled web of a Berlin treaty, to show how to overthrow a government, is to the novel-reader as nothing com-

¹ Cardinal Franzelin, S. J., *De Deo Uno*, sect. i., p. 41.

pared with unfolding the mesh of Belinda's love for Orlando, or the catastrophe of her fainting fit. Such is human nature. It doubtless is a lamentable fact that it should be so, but we have to take men and women as we find them. Consequently it is not surprising to know that the novels of Miss Braddon are far more popular than those of Mr. Disraeli, and viewed merely as novels are doubtless far more interesting and cleverly written. Bulwer's stories certainly are so; as are Dickens's, and even Thackeray's, who, in his way, was fond of preaching a lay sermon.

One thing, and one thing only, saved Disraeli's stories. The author was always a much more interesting personage than any he depicted, than even the fantastic heroes that are supposed to represent himself. This is really a high compliment to the author. He is read less for the sake of his story than of the teller. At the same time his stories have certain characteristics, certain interests of their own, a special value and special peculiarities, that no man ever before commanded or will in all probability ever command again. There is a fund of worldly wisdom in all of them, not excluding the extravagance of *Vivian Grey*, a marvellous keenness and accuracy of observation, a happy method of individualizing a character in a few sentences, of analyzing and unfolding the ideas that move the men who move the world, occasionally a quiet Mephistophelian laugh at the jumble of persons, motives, and blunders that we call the world, which no story-writer has so completely exhibited. This cannot fail to be interesting, and to students of the world of human nature is more attractive than even the loves of Belinda and Orlando.

To most people, too, of course not to the high and mighty personages who are above all human weakness and human prejudice, there is something attractive in the fact that the author of *Endymion* is Lord Beaconsfield; not that he is an earl,—even earls, it is to be supposed, can talk and write nonsense,—but that he is the particular person he is. After all, Lord Beaconsfield is one of the world's statesmen. He is a man of affairs, and of great affairs. His story, as before said, is more romantic than any he could possibly write. The man who challenged O'Connell, by whom he was very nearly crushed; who rose up from his discomfiture to destroy Peel; who, rising from what to the Tories was nothing, fought his way to the chieftainship of that aristocratic and rather thickheaded party; who, to use his own phrase, "educated them up" to modern ideas, and finally, after a quarter of a century of failure and hopeless disaster, led them into the promised land of office and victory, will always be one of the most picturesque figures of the age. From the bench of an attorney's clerk to an honored seat at the Berlin Con-

gress is a long and eventful leap, and the man who made it by the sheer force of his will, his intellect, his skill, and undaunted courage is necessarily a worthy study to his fellow-men.

This is the man, deep in years and hard-won honor of the highest kind that this world recognizes, who sits down to tell the world a story of a little love and of great adventure. He has already passed the years of threescore and ten. For half a century he has battled with fortune, with adverse circumstances, and with as keen opposing intellects and as strong prejudices and hates as can prevail in political life. If he has not wholly conquered he has at least won great victories, and has certainly not been vanquished. It is not now the aspiring and dreaming youth of the author of *Vivian Grey* who is flinging his startling views into the arena of English life and politics, audaciously telling England how it ought to be governed, what questions are those of deepest moment, how parties are to be formed. "The wondrous boy who wrote *Alroy*," as merry Father Prout put it, is now a very old gentleman indeed and sadly afflicted with the gout. It was hardly to be expected that he should show all the old fire, the free daring spirit, the abounding audacity of half a century ago. Time and struggle chasten all men gifted with sense, and who recognize a world outside themselves, their thoughts, and their schemes,—a world, that will sometimes agree, but more often disagree with them. Moreover, success is itself a great chastener of great spirits. It entails responsibility. As long as we are Ishmaels, our hand against every man's, we may do and dare and say anything. We are our own masters and answerable only for our own actions. But once in power, once charged with the cares and, to some extent, the guidance of others, we have to take them into account and subdue ourselves to their requirements. This Disraeli did. His novels poured out thick and fast while still he was a political Ishmael, while fighting his way and feeling the public pulse. Like most young men determined to make for themselves a high place in the world, he set in by being a reformer, and young reformers find everything wrong. He was even what is called a radical,—dreadful name, that is not always clearly defined, yet is generally used to stamp a man as with the brand of Cain. The Church was wrong; the land was wrong; the parties were wrong; the order of society was wrong; literature was wrong; the Eastern question was not understood at all and the conduct of it was very wrong indeed. The inference was obvious. The only man who really comprehended the general situation and was fitted to set things right, in fact, to restore England to the position she held at the Congress of Vienna and possibly advance her a step higher, was the author of *Vivian Grey*.

And who was the author of *Vivian Grey*? Nobody exactly knew. There was a pale young man, rather gorgeously attired, with a Jewish cast of countenance and a lofty brow set off by carefully cultivated raven locks, who had gained the *entrée* to certain fashionable London houses and insisted on showing himself wherever he could be seen to the best advantage. In dress and appearance he manifested the florid taste of his race. He was half a dreamer, half a scoffer; highly sensitive, yet with a calm confidence in himself. He believed he had "a mission," what particular mission was not very clear; but, as he says in *Endymion*, "men with missions do not disappear till they have fulfilled them." This was one of the oracular *dicta* in which young Mr. Disraeli and old Mr. Disraeli had the habit of indulging. They have a profound sound; they contain often more than half truths, and yet they may be wholly wrong. All men of character probably have missions in this world, but the missions often fail because the missionaries fail. They get married, or they die, or are won over to the other side, or get rich, or get the gout, and leave the mission to some one else. This young man's mission was probably simply the natural ambition of one who felt in himself great things stirring. He had no special religious faith. His father was a book man, a very delightful *litterateur*, a Hebrew who deserted his faith for the reason apparently that his own people bothered him too much about it. He did little for his son. He left him a name of some honor and distinction, and doubtless many charming memories, for the son always revered his father. The boy received baptism in the Anglican Church. His ambition grew with him, and soared very high. Its highest object was to be Prime Minister of England. It was a wild dream, but it took hold of him. Politics became his absorbing study. To rise in this most fascinating, powerful, and dangerous world, he bent every energy of an indomitable will and a plastic and keen intelligence. He did not study books so much as men and women. The all-powerful influence of women in human life, whatever its form or grade, has always been one of his fixed dogmas.

To this end literature was with him but a stepping-stone. He never valued it for itself. Every novel he wrote was a political pamphlet, and one worthy of attention if not of study. It was the only means at the time for a young and unknown man to catch the eye and the ear of the great world. He seized on it and used it with wonderful effect. Much of what he wrote was laughed at, but it was all read, and by the very world for which he chiefly intended it. The style was not of the best; but it was full of daring spirit, of biting irony, of much truth very clearly and forcibly put, of intense sarcasm for many cherished beliefs and in-

stitutions of one or both of the great English parties. Public characters under the thinnest guise of fiction were pilloried as Junius never pilloried his victims. It is sad to confess it; but probably the most enjoyable reading for the general public is strong and clever assaults on its leading public characters. Disraeli saw this, and whetted his favorite weapon of satire on almost every man of mark.

The story of his first attempts to enter Parliament under the shield of O'Connell, and the manner in which he repaid O'Connell's kind offices, is too well known to need mention here. The great Irishman gave the man who turned on him considerably more than he had received; and the name of Disraeli will never be mentioned without calling up the image of the "lineal descendant of the impenitent thief," an illustration that only O'Connell could draw. It is not the purpose here to trace the chequered political career of the man who, beginning by being a radical, fastened himself on the Tory party, and to secure his leadership ousted Peel for accepting a policy that he himself has accepted long since; much as he defeated Earl Russel for his "revolutionary" Reform Bill only to supplant it by one more revolutionary still. As he advanced in power and became absorbed in the business of politics his novels were necessarily less frequent. He had attained the purpose for which they were written. He scorned to be a mere literary man. Literature was to him nothing; merely a means to an end. The world had almost forgotten Disraeli the novelist in Disraeli the statesman. A new generation had sprung up very different in mode of life, thought, and tone from the "Young England" to which Disraeli made his first addresses. The new generation was going wrong. It was going to Rome on one side and revolution on the other. It needed guidance and instruction; a new gospel in fact. So Mr. Disraeli gave it *Lothair*, which was meant to be at once an anti-Catholic and an anti-revolutionary pamphlet.

Why he suddenly and in so absurd a manner assailed the Catholics it is hard to say, save for a poor political effect. His earlier works, where they manifested any religious sympathy at all, divided it between Catholicity and Hebraism. Some of the finest characters in all his stories are Catholics, and Catholics endowed with every virtue of mind and soul. This treatment of them was particularly noble and generous in Disraeli's earlier days. On the other hand, no man probably ever so mercilessly assailed Anglican pretensions and the Anglican episcopate. The chieftain of a party must in shifting times such as these be more or less of a trimmer; so in the debates on the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland, there was something ironical in the posi-

tions of the two opposing leaders. Mr. Gladstone had set out by writing a work on *Church and State* of which an Archbishop of Canterbury might be proud. Yet he came in as the leveller of that branch of the "deadly Upas-tree" that overshadowed Ireland, the Established Church. Mr. Disraeli, the bitter assailant of the same Church, rose up with more than orthodox solemnity as the champion of the inviolable union between Church and State in Ireland as everywhere else. It may have been this that led to the production of *Lothair*, which read like a party cry to his followers; a cry that arrayed the Catholic Church and European Liberalism as the common foes of Englishmen, and a common danger to the laws and liberties of the realm.

Lothair, though a financial success, could scarcely be styled so in a literary sense. It was certainly not a model of English style; it was not an interesting novel; it was fantastic as ever; to a Catholic it was in many of the portions relating to Catholic affairs absurd and insulting. Nevertheless, it had pages and pages of great wisdom, skilful characterization, and power. After *Lothair*, to use a convenient expression of the author's, "many things happened." Mr. Gladstone's "blustering majority" blew itself to pieces; and, rather to his surprise, Mr. Disraeli found himself in power with a strong majority at his back for the first time. *Vivian Grey's* wildest dreams were at length realized, and destined to be realized more fully than ever that prophetic youth could by any possibility have foreseen.

It was in 1874, and nothing remarkable occurred for some time. In the summer of 1875, however, a little insurrection broke out in Herzegovina. The Porte set to work to put it down, and in three months confessed itself out of funds. The borrowed funds of European capitalists given to sustain the Turkish Empire were gone, not even the Turks knew whither, and there was nothing to show for them. The insurgents took courage and the insurrection spread. It is not difficult to feed an insurrection in the South of Europe. Meanwhile the new Premier had sprung one of the surprises in which he delights, both in politics and fiction, on the English people. They learned with extreme gratification that the government had purchased what was practically a controlling share in the Suez Canal. This was the beginning of the "spirited foreign policy," with which the Tory party had been credited so long as they had no opportunity of exerting any foreign policy at all in the cool shade of opposition. The little insurrection in Herzegovina developed with startling rapidity into the war between Russia and Turkey. The details of the struggle are known. After overcoming their severe reverses the Russian armies swarmed down upon Constantinople. Now or never was the time for England to

manifest a spirited foreign policy. The Russians were at the very gates of Constantinople. That lightning diplomatist, General Ignatieff, of whom little has been heard since,—little is heard of men who have failed,—had concluded a snap treaty with Turkey, that was to all intents and purposes a Russian dictation. England was alarmed, but popular feeling was still sluggish to move. The organs of public opinion were strongly against active interference, however much they might cry out against the rapacity of Russia. Lord Beaconsfield, for to that well-won dignity he had come at last, was always a keen observer as well as a daring man. He knew the English people better than the editors of newspapers, whose business it is to know everything, and, therefore, too much. After the death of Palmerston, the Liberal statesmen of England had settled down contentedly to the policy of non-interference in foreign affairs. This policy had become a tradition and a custom; and “custom,” as Sidney Wilson says in *Endymion*, “in England is a power; but let some event suddenly occur which makes a nation feel or think, and the whole thing might vanish like a dream.”

The event had occurred; the nation was aroused; it felt and thought that Russia was going to secure to itself Constantinople. Lord Beaconsfield discussed the signs of the times, and at the sacrifice of two of his chief colleagues in the Ministry, on his own responsibility, ordered the British fleet into Besika Bay and called in to Malta a contingent of the Indian troops. English public opinion approved of the bold action. Europe realized that the movement meant war if Russia was not stayed; so, to prevent war, General Ignatieff's Stevano treaty with Turkey was laid on the table of the Berlin Congress of Powers, considered before them clause by clause, and to some extent modified.

And at that memorable Congress, the most memorable and eventful since the Congress of Vienna, with Prince Bismarck presiding and Prince Gortchakoff opposing, and the representatives of the Powers of Europe around him, sat Vivian Grey, now quite an old man, but with the power of Great Britain in his hand. No figure was more conspicuous and none more interesting than that of the “lineal descendant of the impenitent thief.” He was credited with having won his way there and asserted England's authority in European councils. Before leaving he effected another *coup*, another surprise. He returned to England with Cyprus in his pocket, purchased at a dangerous price it is true, but Englishmen did not consider the cost at the moment. His return was an ovation. The people grew wild over him, much as they grew wild over Wellington after Waterloo. It was considered a Waterloo of diplomacy, without the spilling of a drop of English blood. He received the charter of the city of London, which had already illuminated in

his honor. The Queen, whom he had made an Empress, made him a Knight of the Garter. His enemies were vanquished. His cup of honor was full to overflowing. The English people were so proud of him, so confident of his sagacity, so trustful of his skill, in conducting the affairs of the nation, that in two years from that date they turned him out of office and turned his rival in.

Outside of the region of arms was there ever a more remarkable career? This is the man who, in his brief exile from office and in his declining years, sits down to tell the world another story: *Endymion*. The world cannot help being interested in it; in what such a man has to say in any form. And what is *Endymion*? His former stories were chiefly political pamphlets written with a direct purpose. This is in the main a political retrospect, and as becomes the years and in a sense the completed fortunes of the man; for, though it is by no means unlikely that he will return to office and possibly set the stamp of his mind and character again on English legislation, it is not likely that he will ever again surpass the startling brilliancy of the past. The sense that he has almost fulfilled his "mission" is visible in *Endymion*. He has nothing new to propose. He goes back to the period of his early years and struggles, the stormy time at which he entered public life, and touches and illuminates that period by the gathered wisdom of years in the bright light of the present. All is memory, reflection, anecdote, pictures of men dead and gone, their struggles and failures, triumphs and hopes, policies and fears, lit with a little pale love in order to make a story and forcing with skilfully concealed purpose past lessons to bear on present events. There lies the whole interest of the story; the reminiscences and reflections of a man of exceptional experience of public life and public men and measures, whose intellect is undimmed and who still stands before the world as one of its leading statesmen as well as one of its most unique and picturesque characters.

The chastening influence of half a century of struggle, chequered by great failures and triumphs as great, of profound experience and deepening years, is everywhere discernible. The brilliant dash, the headlong *elan*, the audacious scorn of most men and measures, of policies and methods, of society and its humbugs, of petticoat politics and twaddling ministers, that marked *Vivian Grey*, *Tancred*, *Coningsby*, and the rest of them, is not to be found in *Endymion*. The very form has suffered in consequence. The style in many parts is quite slipshod and faulty. Perhaps Lord Beaconsfield, with the scorn he here manifests and frequently expresses for mere literary men, feels himself above conforming to the ordinary demands of English composition. It was once complained that the Queen's speeches were written in "washerwoman's Eng-

lish," whatever that felicitous style may be. Exception might be taken to the charge, on the ground that at least washerwomen may be credited with the faculty of expressing themselves clearly on matters within their comprehension, a character that as a rule is conspicuously absent from Queen's speeches. Still the charge was made under a liberal administration. *Endymion* perhaps is not a model of "washerwoman's English," but then it might be worse. At times it is very bad, as any one who reads it will discover before having finished a dozen pages. At the same time it is pleasing to confess that in other respects Lord Beaconsfield's right hand has not forgotten its cunning. There are still all the old characteristics, good as well as bad. There is the old gloating over fine furniture, fine surroundings, fine jewels—he is always strong on jewels with a sort of race instinct—fine people. In Lord Beaconsfield's story there are many mansions, many palaces, very few houses. There is an oppressiveness of glitter and glare. The very lackeys of the great people wear a glorified air, and their powder and puffs seem as incense in the author's nostrils. They glide through gilded saloons, where great personages kiss the hands of gorgeously arrayed ladies, supported by costly cushions, and then vanish into air. All the glitter, the trappings of this favored region, that to men born in the purple are simple matters of course, and call for no special mention, are brought out in the strongest relief and in every possible light by the man who has forced his way into the sacred precincts of the nobility. He looks down contemptuously on the frantic and envious attempts of the St. Barbes to follow him, and graciously shows them the distinction between the real article and the spurious; the nobility as he is allowed to see them, and not the nobility in the imagination of the St. Barbes. The nobility ought to feel deeply indebted to their champion, while novel-mongers, who are in the habit of consulting the Ouidas or Miss Braddon for a knowledge of the habits and customs of the peerage, ought to feel equally grateful to the ennobled author, though perhaps they may feel some twinges of disappointment at not finding the nobility exactly as wicked as a long course of novel-study had led them to expect.

The story takes us back to what in these rapid days are almost prehistoric times. It opens at the period of the first Reform Bill, and gives some brief but very interesting pictures of London and London life at that epoch. People still travelled by stage-coach, and sedan-chairs were not absolutely out of fashion. The memory of Waterloo was fresh in men's minds. It was not long since Castlereagh's death, and Canning was in power. It was a stirring time. The revolt of the American Colonies and establishment of the Republic of the United States, the outbreak of the French

Revolution, the astonishing career of Napoleon Bonaparte, had set men everywhere thinking, and served to a considerable degree to open up their minds. There were questions afloat on all sides, and behind all was the irresistible influence of popular progress.

"'They have got a new name for this hybrid sentiment,' said the Ambassador. 'They call it public opinion.'

"'How very absurd!' said Zenobia; 'a mere nickname. As if there could be any opinion but that of the sovereign and the two houses of Parliament!'

"'They are trying to introduce here the Continental Liberalism,' said the great personage. 'Now we know what Liberalism means on the Continent. It means the abolition of property and religion. Those ideas would not suit this country; I often puzzle myself to foresee how they will attempt to apply Liberal opinions here.'"

Such were some of the questions beginning to agitate the world in that day, and which have not yet altogether ceased to move it. But the world of that day was very different from ours.

"The great world then, compared with the huge society of the present period, was limited in its proportions, and composed of elements more refined though far less various. It consisted mainly of the great landed aristocracy, who had quite absorbed the nabobs of India, and had nearly appropriated the huge West Indian fortunes. . . . Those vast and successful invasions of society by new classes, which have since occurred, though impending, had not yet commenced. The manufacturers, the railway kings, the colossal contractors, the discoverers of nuggets, had not yet found their place in society and the Senate. There were then, perhaps, more great houses open than at the present day, but there were very few little ones. . . .

"The season then was brilliant and sustained, but it was not flurried. People did not go to various parties on the same night. They remained where they were assembled, and, not being in a hurry, were more agreeable than they are at the present day. Conversation was more cultivated; manners, though unconstrained, were more stately; and the world being limited, knew itself much better. On the other hand, the sympathies of society were more contracted than they are at present. The pressure of population had not opened the heart of man. The world attended to its poor in its country parishes, and subscribed and danced for the Spitalfields weavers when their normal distress had overflowed; but their knowledge of the people did not exceed these bounds, and the people knew very little more about themselves. They were only half born."

This is doubtless a very true, as it is unquestionably a very graphic picture of the state of society at the time. If society has widened, and the people gained much since those days, then some things have been lost that were worth retaining. As for the state of the Church then, the present champions of Anglicanism had evidently a very low estimate of its ways, if not quite so ferociously drawn as Macaulay's of the same Church, in the eighteenth century.

"The English Church had no competent leaders among the clergy. The spirit that has animated and disturbed our later times seemed quite dead, and no one anticipated its resurrection. The bishops had been selected from college dons, men profoundly ignorant of the condition and wants of the country. To have edited a Greek play with second-rate success, or to have been the tutor of some considerable patrician,

was the qualification then deemed desirable and sufficient for an office, which at this day is at least reserved for eloquence and energy. The social influence of the Episcopal bench was nothing. A prelate was rarely seen in the saloons of Zenobia. It is since the depths of religious thought have been probed, and the influence of woman in the spread and sustenance of religious feeling has again been recognized, that fascinating and fashionable prelates have become favored guests in the refined saloons of the mighty, and while apparently indulging in the vanities of the hour, have re-established the influence which in old days guided a Matilda or the mother of Constantine."

Nothing could be better told than all this, and the comprehensive directness and strong simplicity of the style shows the author at his best, and he is at his best in writing when he is least himself. A companion picture to it, is the education of a prospective cabinet minister of the period.

"Those were days when a crack university regulation often opened the doors of the House of Commons to a young aspirant—at least after a season. But Ferrars had not to wait. There, if his career had not yet realized the dreams of his youthful admirers, it had at least been one of progress and unbroken prosperity. His first speech was successful, though florid, but it was on foreign affairs, which permit rhetoric, and in those days demanded at least one Virgilian quotation. In this latter branch of oratorical adornment Ferrars was never deficient. No young man of that time, and scarcely any old one, ventured to address Mr. Speaker without being equipped with a Latin passage. Ferrars, in this respect, was triply armed. Indeed, when he entered public life, full of hope and promise, though disciplined to a certain extent by his mathematical training, he had read very little more than some Latin writers, some Greek plays, and some treatises of Aristotle. These, with a due course of Bampton Lectures and some dipping into the *Quarterly Review*, then in its prime, qualified a man in those days, not only for being a member of Parliament, but becoming a candidate for the responsibility of statesmanship."

The Ferrars here mentioned is the father of the hero, Endymion, and of his twin sister, Myra. In the shifting course of politics Ferrars fails; his great promise and expectations come to naught. He retires early, a broken-down man, and his mind and courage refusing to bear up against the strain of misfortune put upon them, he ends by committing suicide. His children, brought up in every early luxury, are thrown penniless upon the world. Myra, gifted with great beauty of person, keen intelligence, and an indomitable will, devotes her life and purpose to the lifting up of their fallen fortunes and setting her brother on the highest pinnacle of fame. He resembles her in beauty, but his nature is more tender and plastic, his sensitiveness greater, his courage and resolution less, though his mental gifts are considerable. Before his death his father had secured Endymion a position in the civil service. Myra obtains a position as companion to their daughter in the great banking family of Neuchatel (Rothschild). Neuchatel's position enables him to gather all sorts of persons about him, from exiled princes to English peers, and from cabinet ministers to stock-brokers. Into this society Myra is thrown and Endymion is occa-

sionally admitted to it. There she meets the young Prince Florestan, a kindly disguise for Louis Napoleon; and Lord Roehampton, the Foreign Secretary and strongest member of the cabinet, a not unkindly disguise for Lord Palmerston. Lord Roehampton is a widower of two years' standing and no longer young, but then, as Lady Montfort, who insists on his marrying at least for the sake of the party, says: "His mind and manner are young, and that is everything." He falls in love with Myra, proposes, is accepted, and at one step she moves to the head of Whig society. Endymion's prospects brighten proportionately. He advances from step to step and enters Parliament under Lord Roehampton's tuition and protecting ægis. He becomes acquainted with public affairs, with public men, and a favorite with great women, especially with Lady Montfort, who divides with Myra the social leadership of the Whig party. Meanwhile, Prince Florestan, who was secretly in love with Myra, leaves England, lands in his own country, effects a rising and makes an easy triumphal march to the throne which he claimed. He always regards himself as a child of destiny, and is a happily drawn picture of the complex character of a dreamer who is when occasion comes a man of action and of purpose. Lord Roehampton suddenly dies, which considerably affects Endymion's prospects. He has by this time, however, made some mark and advanced far enough in politics to walk alone. He has come to be regarded as one of the rising young men, and a valuable addition to the party. In her grief and widowhood Lady Roehampton, on the eve of re-entering society, receives a mysterious message. It is an offer of the hand and the throne of Prince Florestan, which, as may be supposed, she is not the woman to refuse. As a fitting preparation she embraces the Catholic faith, being received into the Church by the Archbishop of Tyre *in partibus*, formerly Nigel Penruddock, a convert from the Anglican ministry, and also an old lover of hers. Her triumphal progress through the kingdom to the capital of her royal lover is described with all the minute and fantastic gorgeousness of Lord Beaconsfield's style, when he is by no means at his best. Lord Montfort, a lazy though intellectual sybarite, drawn with delicate skill, dies at a happy juncture. Endymion marries the beautiful and brilliant widow, an alliance that brings him all the social position, wealth, and power he needs, in order to place himself at the head of his party and realize the ambition of his sister. All things being thus prepared for his advancement, a stroke of the pen kills off the Whig premier, and Endymion is summoned to Windsor to construct a cabinet.

Such in brief is the thread of the story. Slender enough in plot, and even more than usually full of the author's series of astonish-

ing climaxes and anti-climaxes. Surprise follows surprise to the verge of absurdity. In this respect the story is disjointed, loose, fragmentary, "most fearfully and wonderfully made." But that is the least part of it and the worst. Aside from this there is an abundance of material that will be found to repay study, that compels attention, interest, and admiration, and that probably no other man in the world could present with such keen precision and masterly skill. It is the dramatization of history by one who helps to make history. The author has constructed the road of his success on human weaknesses. Perhaps no man living has made a closer or more accurate study of the infinite phases of human character. Consequently no man more thoroughly delineates the surface of a character, whether in a few strong strokes or in elaborate detail. He does not always go down to the depths of souls, and of great souls. His love-making is generally silly and laughable. "Beautiful, fascinating being," says Lord Rochampton, who is represented as a great favorite with the sex, "let me at least tell you of my love." Even Myra's cold ambitious nature could hardly prevent a smile at being addressed as a "fascinating being" at the critical moment when the elderly peer is popping the question. "All seasons would be to me fascination," says Nigel Penruddock to the same "fascinating being," "were I only by your side. Yes; I can no longer repress the irresistible confession of my love. . . . I can no longer resist the consummate spell, and I offer you my heart and my life."

"Is it too bold to hope," writes Florestan still to the same "fascinating being," "that I may find a companion in you to charm and counsel me? I can offer you nothing equal to your transcendent merit, but I can offer you the heart and throne of Florestan."

The author's lovers make love as though they were preparing a petition to the Queen or to Parliament, nor does he waste his energies on human suffering and sorrow. As a rule the only suffering he depicts is as ill-fortune or disappointed ambition. He never probes to the founts of human nature. He is content with the surface that men see and know; but he is admirable in showing every ripple, every shade, and every turn and winding of the stream of human life. He was taught in a bitter school, one calculated to make even a successful man hard and cold, cynical and scoffing. He can be all this, and is all this. At the same time, there is a fund of natural human kindness in the man. The tender feelings of father and son, brother and sister, mother and daughter, always catch his sympathy, and he loves to emphasize them. He is even stronger in his sympathy for heroic youth. He is never weary of encouraging youth, condoning its passing failures, and

urging it to courage and to hope. With youth, intelligence, will, and strength of character, he believes that anything or almost anything may be accomplished in this world. After all, it is only on the unworthy, the shams, brilliant or unbrilliant, that he uses his unrivalled and cultivated powers of sarcasm; while he cannot resist the temptation of showing up the graceful foibles of society in a manner as natural and highly artistic as it is diverting. Now and then flits across the page a Mephistophelian smile at all things and persons, the objects and purposes of all human ambition and strife, as though experience had taught him the deep truth of Solomon's words: "Vanity of vanities, and all is vanity."

"He looks unhappy, I think, and worn," says Myra of Prince Florestan.

"One is never worn when one is young," said Lord Roehampton.

"He must have great anxieties and great sorrows," said Myra. "I cannot imagine a position more unfortunate than that of an exiled prince."

"I can," said Lord Roehampton. "To have the feelings of youth and the frame of age."

This is Faust over again, but without even a Mephistopheles to assist him.

"I wish I had been a woman," says St. Barbe in the midst of what to a higher nature would have been a real success. "Women are the only people who get on. A man works all his life, and thinks he has done a wonderful thing if, with one leg in the grave and no hair on his head, he manages to get a coronet; and a woman dances at a ball with some young fellow or other, or sits next to some old fellow at dinner and pretends she thinks him charming, and he makes her a peeress on the spot. Oh! it is a disgusting world; it must end in revolution!"

"'What a rare thing is success in life,' said Endymion. 'I often wonder whether I shall ever be able to step out of the crowd.'

"'You may have success in life without stepping out of the crowd,' said the Baron.

"'A sort of success,' said Endymion; 'I know what you mean. But what I mean is real success in life. I mean I should like to be a public man.'

"'Why?' asked the Baron.

"'Well, I should like to have power,' said Endymion, blushing.

"'The most powerful men are not public men,' said the Baron. 'A public man is responsible, and a responsible man is a slave. It is private life that governs the world. You will find this out some day. The world talks much of powerful sovereigns and great ministers; and if being talked about made me powerful, they would be irresistible. But the fact is the more you are talked about, the less powerful you are.'

"'But surely King Luitprand is a powerful monarch; they say he is the wisest of men. And the Emperor Harold, who has succeeded in everything. And as for ministers, who is a great man if it be not Prince Wenceslaus?'

"King Luitprand is governed by his doctor, who is capable of governing Europe, but has no ambition that way; the Emperor Harold is directed by his mistress, who is a woman of a certain age, with a vast sagacity, but who also believes in sorcery; and as for Prince Wenceslaus, he is inspired by an individual as obscure as ourselves, and who, for aught I know, may be at this moment, like ourselves, drinking a cup of coffee in a hired lodging."

So much for Baron Sergius's views of public life and public honors. Baron Sergius had attended the Congress of Vienna, and won distinction even in that brilliant circle of old-school diplomats. Hardly a department of public life, or society, or character, that does not fall under the observation of the author, to be brought out in a manner wholly felicitous. He seems to have a great grudge against literary men. Is it because he felt their stings too keenly for all his acquired imperviousness to hostile shafts? St. Barbe is generally taken for a portrait of Thackeray, and much of it corresponds with the original. Lord Beaconsfield would seem to have added on to it something of the higher order of Bohemian newspaper correspondent, who climbs up the back stairs of great personages to sniff information for his journal, and is dying to get into the "society," whose members he occasionally buttonholes in a dark corner. Thackeray was surely not this. Thackeray had an honest way of judging men and women by their lives. Royalty to him could never veil meanness or excuse vice. He would certainly never gloat over furniture, jewelry, "gems of Golconda," "palatial mansions," "distinguished equipages," with the Epicurean sense of delight, of the beauty of all these things, that Lord Beaconsfield manifests. Yet he is invariably presented as the meanest, vainest, most envious of mankind. In fact, all the literary board are the same to the man who can only see in a critic one who has failed in literature or art.

"A dinner of wits," he says, writing in his own person, "is proverbially a palace of silence, and the envy and hatred which all literary men really feel for each other, especially when they are exchanging dedications of mutual affection, always insure in such assemblies the agreeable presence of a general feeling of painful constraint. If a good thing occurs to a guest he will not express it, lest his neighbor, who is publishing a novel in numbers, shall appropriate it next month, or he himself, who has the same responsibility of production, be deprived of its legitimate appearance."

One can only wonder at reading such an outburst with what kind of literary men Lord Beaconsfield has been acquainted, or how such very mean ideas of any class of men can have got into his head. It almost justifies the fierce letter of John Ruskin recently to the Scotch students, where he asked them what in the devil's name they had to do with Beaconsfield or Gladstone. That to him they were nothing more than a couple of old droning bagpipes, piping out now one tune and now another. Or Carlyle's estimate,

of "him they call Dizzy," which is certainly not flattering to Lord Beaconsfield, and may have provoked his ire. But imagine great-hearted, free-handed Thackeray jabbering in this style :

"Only think of our meeting here! I wonder why they asked you! You are not going to Paris, and you are not a wit. What a family this is! I had no idea of wealth before! Did you observe the silver plates? I could not hold mine with one hand, it was so heavy. I do not suppose there are such plates in the world. It gives one an idea of the galleons and Anson's plunder. But they deserve their wealth," he added; "nobody grudges it to them. I declare when I was eating that truffle I felt a glow about my heart that, if it were not indigestion, I think must have been gratitude, though that is an article I had not believed in. He is a wonderful man, that Neuchatel. If I had only known him a year ago, I would have dedicated my novel to him. He is a sort of man who would have given you a check immediately. He would not have read it, to be sure, but what of that? If you had dedicated it to a lord, the most he would have done would have been to have asked you to dinner, and then perhaps have cut up your work in one of the quality reviews, and taken money for doing it out of our pockets! Oh! it is too horrid. . . . Now I dare say that ambassador has been blundering all his life, and yet there is something in that star and ribbon. I do not know how you feel, but I could almost go down on my knees to him. And there is a cabinet minister. Well, we know what he is; I have been squibbing him for these two years, and now that I meet him, I feel like a mob. Oh! there is an immense deal of superstition still left in the world."

There is much more of the same style of thing. But after all, is it so much St. Barbe who weighs the plates and is grateful for the truffle so much as his noble delineator? Is it St. Barbe who thus approaches the contents of a casket with the reverence of a devotee drawing near a sacred shrine?

"It came from a foreign land, and Waldershare superintended the opening of the case, and the appearance of a casket of crimson velvet, with genuine excitement. But when it was opened! There was a coronet of brilliants and emeralds, and one of sapphires and brilliants, and dazzling bracelets, and all the stones more than precious gems of Golconda no longer obtainable, and lustrous companions which only could have been created in the hot earth of Asia."

The literary men may forgive Lord Beaconsfield his peevish outburst against them after that gorgeous passage on the jewels. It explains many things; among others the early affection of young Mr. Disraeli for noisy watch-chains and offensive rings. The remark of Neuchatel, who in the new order of things has been made a peer, is characteristic and worthy a noble of his race. "When the revolution comes," said Lord Hainault, "Lord Waldershare and my daughter must turn jewellers. Their stock-in-trade is ready." If Waldershare were only true to the character drawn of him, such a remark from his future father-in-law would at once have broken off the match. And here is St. Barbe in himself:

"The fact is, I wrote too early," he would say. "I blush when I read my own books, though compared with those of the brethren they might still be looked on as classics. They say that no artist can draw a camel, and I say no author can draw a

gentleman. How can they, with no opportunity of ever seeing one? And so, with a little caricature of manners, which they catch second-hand, they are obliged to have recourse to outrageous nonsense, as if polished life consisted only of bigamists, and ladies of fashion were in the habit of paying black-mail to returned convicts. However, I shall put an end to all this. I have now got the materials or am accumulating them daily. You hint that I give myself up too much to society. You are talking of things you do not understand. A dinner party is a chapter. I catch the Cynthia of the minute, sir, at a *soirée*. If I only served a grateful country, I should be in the proudest position of any of its sons; if I had been born in any country but this, I should have been decorated, and perhaps made secretary of state like Addison, who did not write as well as I do, though his style somewhat resembles mine.' "

That at least has the merit of being amusing, and is a very clever skit. But Lord Beaconsfield is not at his best when trying to run a character to earth; no man is. Malice is never pleasing, and there is a deep tinge of malice in all that relates to St. Barbe, which spoils the effect of what might have been otherwise a very laughable and even brilliant characterization. There are other characters in the book much more agreeable. Cardinal Manning is again introduced in the person of Nigel Penruddock, not as in *Lothair*, laying theatrical traps to catch noble converts, but arguing himself out of Anglicanism into the Catholic faith. "He had great eloquence; his views were startling and commanding, and his expressions forcible and picturesque. All were heightened, too, by his striking personal appearance and the beauty of his voice. He seemed something between a young prophet and an inquisitor; a remarkable blending of enthusiasm and self-control." Here is how he talks while still an Anglican curate, filling London with the praise of his eloquence:

" 'That Lady Montfort is a great woman,' said Nigel, standing with his back to the fire; 'she has it in her to be another Empress Helena.'

" 'Indeed!'

" 'I believe she has only one thought, and that the only thought was this: the human mind—the Church. . . .'

" 'I am rather surprised,' said Endymion, 'at a Whig lady entertaining such high views in these matters. The Liberal party rather depend on the Low Church.'

" 'I know nothing about Whigs or Tories or Liberals, or any other new names which they invent,' said Nigel, 'nor do I know or care to know, what Low Church means. There is but one Church, and it is Catholic and Apostolic; and if we act on its principles there will be no need, there ought to be no need, for any other form of government.'

" 'Well those are very distinct views,' said Endymion, 'but are they as practical as they are clear?'

" 'Why should they not be practical? Everything is practical which we believe; and in the long run, which is most likely that we should believe, what is taught by God or what is taught by man?'

" 'I confess,' said Endymion, 'that in all matters, both civil and religious, I incline to what is moderate and temperate.'

" 'I know nothing about politics,' said Nigel. 'By being moderate and temperate in politics, I suppose you mean being adroit, and doing that which is expedient, and which will probably be successful. But the Church is founded on absolute truth, and teaches absolute truth, and there can be no compromise on such matters.'

“ ‘Well, I do not know,’ said Endymion, ‘but surely there are many very religious people who do not accept without reserve everything that is taught by the Church. I hope I am a religious person myself, and yet, for example, I cannot give an unreserved assent to the whole of the Athanasian creed.’ ”

“ ‘The Athanasian creed is the most splendid ecclesiastical lyric ever poured forth by the genius of man. I give to every clause of it an implicit assent. It does not pretend to be divine; it is human,—but the Church has hallowed it, and the Church ever acts under the influence of the Divine Spirit. St. Athanasius was by far the greatest man that ever existed. If you cavil at his creed, you will soon cavil at other symbols.’ ”

“ ‘But let us be calm, my dear Nigel. Do you mean to say that I am to be considered an infidel or an apostate because, although I fervently embrace all the vital truths of religion, and try, on the whole, to regulate my life by them, I may have scruples about believing, for example, in the personality of the devil?’ ”

“ ‘If the personality of Satan be not a vital principle of your religion, I do not know what is. There is only one dogma higher. You think it is safe, and I dare say it is fashionable, to fall into this lax and really thoughtless discrimination between what is and what is not to be believed. It is not good taste to believe in the devil. Give me a single argument against his personality which is not applicable to the personality of the Deity. Will you give that up; and if so, where are you? Now mark me; you and I are young men,—you are a very young man. This is the year of grace 1839. If these loose thoughts, which you have heedlessly taken up, prevail in this country for a generation or so,—five and twenty, or thirty years,—we may meet together again, and I shall have to convince you that there is a God.’ ”

One of the many astonishing accomplishments of that wonderfully gifted youth, Vivian Grey, was his power of throwing himself into the character and tone of thought of another man, so that in his own person he could reproduce even the other's form of speech. He could improvise a passage from Burke that would deceive the most expert. Lord Beaconsfield certainly has something of this gift, as the passage just quoted, and indeed, many another that might be quoted, shows, and his characters speak in their proper persons, not unfrequently very much better than the author in his proper person. It is easy to see whither Nigel Penruddock was drifting. Here he is when as Legate of the Pope and Archbishop of Tyre, he returns to England. The time is the time of Cardinal Wiseman, but the figure is plainly intended for Cardinal Manning:

“Nigel was changed. Instead of that anxious and moody look which formerly marred the refined beauty of his countenance, his glance was calm and yet radiant. He was thinner, it might almost be said emaciated, which seemed to add height to his tall figure. . . . Instead of avoiding society, as was his wont in the old days, the Archbishop sought it. And there was nothing exclusive in his social habits; all classes and all creeds, all conditions and all orders of men, were alike interesting to him; they were part of the mighty community with all whose pursuits and passions, and interests and occupations he seemed to sympathize, but respecting which he had only one object,—to bring them back once more to that imperial fold from which, in an hour of darkness and distraction, they had miserably wandered. The conversion of England was deeply engraven on the heart of Penruddock; it was his constant purpose and his daily and nightly prayer.

“So the Archbishop was seen everywhere, even at fashionable assemblies. He

was a frequent guest at banquets which he never tasted, for he was a smiling ascetic ; and though he seemed to be preaching or celebrating high mass in every part of the metropolis, organizing schools, establishing convents, and building cathedrals, he could find time to move philanthropic resolutions at middle-class meetings, attend learned associations, and even occasionally send a paper to the Royal Society."

Waldershare, the brilliant, the erratic, the genius, who is always scheming something astonishing, but never achieving, is quite captivated by the Archbishop, and urges Prince Florestan to come to an understanding with him, and use his influence to regain the throne. The Prince replies :

"My dear Waldershare, it is very true I am a Roman Catholic, but I am also head of the Liberal party in my country, and perhaps, also, on the continent of Europe, and they are not particularly affected to archbishops and popes."

"Old-fashioned twaddle of the Liberal party," exclaimed Waldershare. "There is more true democracy in the Roman Catholic Church than in all the secret societies of Europe."

"There is something in that," said the Prince musingly, "and my friends are Roman Catholics, nominally Roman Catholics. If I were quite sure your mass and the priests generally were nominally Roman Catholics, something might be done."

"As for that," said Waldershare, "sensible men are all of the same religion."

"And pray, what is that?" inquired the Prince.

"Sensible men never tell."

One more extract before closing the review. It is a conversation between Endymion and the Archbishop as they pace the deck of the vessel bearing Myra to her kingdom. Endymion is indignant at his sister's change of faith :

"The time will come when you will recognize it as the consummation of a Divine plan," said the Archbishop.

"I feel great confidence that my sister will never be the slave of superstition," said Endymion. "Her mind is too masculine for that ; she will remember that the throne she fills has been already once lost by the fatal influence of the Jesuits."

"The influence of the Jesuits is the influence of Divine truth," said his companion. "And how is it possible for such influence not to prevail? What you treat as defeats, discomfitures, are events which you do not comprehend. They are incidents all leading to one great end,—the triumph of the Church, that is, the triumph of God."

"I will not decide what are great ends ; I am content to ascertain what is wise conduct. And it would not be wise conduct, in my opinion, for the king to rest upon the Jesuits."

"The Jesuits never fell except from conspiracy against them. It is never the public voice that demands their expulsion or the public effort that accomplishes it. It is always the affairs of sovereigns and statesmen, of politicians, of men, in short, who feel that there is a power at work, and that power one not favorable to their schemes or objects of government."

"Well, we shall see," said Endymion ; "I candidly tell you, I hope the Jesuits will have as little influence in my brother-in-law's kingdom as in my own country."

"As little," said Nigel, somewhat sarcastically, "I should be almost content if the holy order in every country had as much influence as they now have in England."

"I think your grace exaggerates."

"Before two years are passed," said the Archbishop, speaking very slowly, "I

foresee that the Jesuits will be privileged in England, and the hierarchy of our Church recognized.' ”

This to be sure is prophesying after the event ; but nevertheless how startling would have been such a statement uttered at the time ! The Archbishop's brief but thorough defence of the Jesuits will long be quoted, not as his, but as that of the experienced statesman who put the words in his mouth. There are many such condensed yet comprehensive passages, embracing other matters of public interest all the world over, scattered throughout the volume. Indeed it were easy to cut many “ gems of thought ” from its pages, for it is very rich in them. The wit is keen and glittering,—the flash of a diamond,—is often as hard and cold. Now and then a shaft of sarcasm shoots out unexpectedly and goes quivering to the mark. There is little or none of what is called human, but a supreme power of throwing contrasting characters together in a thoroughly natural manner, and their cross-play is infinitely diverting to the reader. No two characters in the volume resemble each other in the slightest degree, yet the number of characters is unusually large. The young men of the foreign office ; the aristocratic radicals of the Dilke order, who sip the most blood-curdling propositions over sumptuous banquets ; the more earnest reformers of the Cobden type ; the great lady politicians, and the rivalries of Zenobia and Berengaria ; the actual statesmen who now and then appear ; the great littlenesses and small greatneses that go to make up the life of what is called the great world, all these furnish excellent material for the keen, sarcastic, yet not all unkindly play of the author's fancy. If the book, as a whole, adds little to the author's literary fame, it will confirm, were confirmation in such a matter needed, his title to the highest rank as a judge of human character and a wit. For the rest, with the exception of St. Burke, the work has a kindlier tone towards all classes of men than its predecessors. Indeed by a characteristic freak of the author's mind it is written from a Whig point of view. The hero and his party are Whigs ; the Tory party is made the butt of ridicule. In this there is probably design. The Tory party here ridiculed is the party as it existed when Vivian Grey aspired to its leadership. What it would have been had not that youthful genius come to its rescue, may be easily imagined from a perusal of *Endymion*. After reading that it will scarcely be possible for a Tory to rise from his seat without humbly thanking heaven for Lord Beaconsfield.

THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK IN EUROPE AT THE
PRESENT DAY.

THE subject-matter of this paper being confined to Europe, this country is naturally excluded from the actual considerations. The intention, moreover, is to circumscribe our reflections mainly within the limits of the strong opposition to the Catholic Church which now prevails everywhere in Europe, because outside of her there is scarcely any religion left, and what is done against the *sects* scarcely deserves to be noticed. With these qualifications the *outlook*, when restricted to the surface, as the word indicates, is the most disheartening which can well be conceived. Our main effort, however, will be directed to point out at the end the strong undercurrents, scarcely visible to the human eye, which form the main ground of the Christian's hope, even in such crisis as this, independently of the promise of the Redeemer.

I. To thoroughly appreciate the desperate aspect of the case, the European countries must be taken apart, yet considered only in large groups, each one of them homogeneous to a certain degree, and consequently more capable of a fair appreciation. We intend to pass in review, first, the former Protestant states of the North of Europe, and secondly, the various countries of the South, called at this day the Latin nations, besides Austria, which, though different ethnologically, must be numbered among these last, because it is eminently a Catholic empire.

1. The German Empire, the Republic of Switzerland, England and her European dependencies, finally the Scandinavian states, form the first branch of the subject. Russia being more Oriental than Western, belonging in fact more to Asia than to Europe, can be logically left aside from these considerations.

Until quite recently a remarkable degree of liberty had been at last granted to the Church in all the Protestant states. In Prussia since the revolutionary outbreak of 1848; in Switzerland ever since the unsuccessful attempt of the French revolutionists to break down the Federal Constitution in 1798; in England at the time of the Catholic emancipation of 1829; in Scandinavia, finally, at a very recent period, when perfect freedom of worship was decreed for all dissidents from the state religion. An extraordinary era of prosperity for the Church had then begun, which has not yet been checked in some of those countries.

The consideration of the German Empire, embracing Prussia as the head, Bavaria, Saxony, Würtemberg, Baden, and other minor states among its members, throw us at once into the midst of the present discussion.

a. Ever since the complete victory of Protestantism in Prussia during the sixteenth century, the Catholic Church had been kept in bondage by the state. By the treaty of Vienna in 1815, it is true, it had been expressly stipulated that the Rhenish provinces, which were then annexed to the Prussian dominions, should not be restricted in the practice of the Catholic religion. But this had no reference to Prussia proper. The revolutionary outbreak of 1848, however, made a complete change in this respect. A new constitution having been granted by the king, some "Articles concerning the Liberty of the Churches" were added to it in 1850, and the Catholics were thenceforth free from at least the most galling restrictions imposed upon them, whilst the Protestant sects, which differed from the "Evangelical" or state religion, ceased to be under the pressure of open proselytism, which before weighed heavily upon them. This addition to the Prussian Constitution had obtained the universal approval of the nation. The Holy See had willingly consented to those "Articles" in behalf of the Catholics, and an unprecedented period of prosperity and spiritual well-being was for them the consequence. It is not possible to give here in detail the motives which induced Prince Bismarck to declare open war on the Church in these circumstances. Possibly there were no other than his unbounded ambition excited by the success of all his previous political and military measures. He wished to be the complete master of Germany and rule over the Church as well as over the state. For this object he brought forward his *Kulturkampf*, which must be examined with attention, after a word has been said of the absolute necessity for it which he pretended the Pope had imposed upon him.

In a speech before the Lower House of the German Parliament, when he suddenly unveiled his plans in 1873, he went so far as to say: "The Episcopal Church of earlier days had, through the revolution effected by the Vatican Council, been changed into an absolute Papal monarchy. At the head of this Church, which in Prussia constituted a state within a state, stood the Pope with autocratic dominion, having absorbed within himself all Episcopal authority. The programme of this mighty Italian monarchy was directly opposed to the programme of the state." This allegation was altogether untrue, and the German bishops in their protestation proved that their "authority" had not been touched upon by any decree of the Vatican Council at which they had assisted. This was consequently a mere pretext of Bismarck's, and he knew it. As if he intended himself to give the proof of it, he went further still in his speech before the Upper House, and indorsed at once all the ranting declamations of ultra Protestants, which he knew to be utterly false.

"It is an indisputable fact," he said, "that the Pope is an enemy of the Gospel, and necessarily also of the Prussian State. The power and means are not forthcoming at present, but if they were, there is no doubt that we heretics should be utterly exterminated. The Church has, however, other means at hand; she confiscates the property of heretics; she makes it no crime for the heretic to be assassinated when opportunity offers, etc." Who can believe this except the besotted hearer of ranting maniacs? This was, however, the great motive assigned by the Prussian Chancellor for the introduction of his pet measures which he was in the act of presenting to the acceptance of his *liberal* Parliament.

The word itself, *Kulturkampf*, means literally "the war of civilization;" and, as in every war there is an enemy to be overcome, the enemy here is superstition; that is, supernatural religion. In the new principles of Prince Bismarck all religions are only human devices; every institution which is supposed to have a supernatural character must be superstitious. The best way for the state to war against it is to assert its total supremacy over it. There must not be, therefore, a separation of Church and state, but such a close union between them that the Church should be entirely absorbed by the state. The civil government, consequently, is the only source of jurisdiction, dogma, morality, or whatever has been considered so far the peculiar province of the Church. Thus the consecration of bishops, the ordination of priests, the local assignment and restricted jurisdiction of parish priests and inferior ministers, the teaching from the pulpit, the religious instruction given to children, even, we suppose, the articles of the creed, and the interpretation of the Ten Commandments; in all this, and in the thousand questions connected with the whole scheme of the spiritual order, the state is not only paramount, but, in fact, the only source of authority in matters of belief and morals. This is the real meaning of the word *Kulturkampf*. It has been called by some ardent Catholics the declaration of *State Godship*, and this has roused the ire of the partisans of this system. But though it is true that M. de Bismarck has never pretended to be the God of heaven, he has, in fact, made himself the god of Germany, by attributing to the head of government the functions which all Christians have always declared must come from God alone and His Church. What must Americans say of these pretensions of the *great* Chancellor, when all among them—believers and unbelievers—are so careful to always leave the management of Church affairs to the Church alone?

The first step, however, to establish the *Kulturkampf*, and enact laws in conformity with it, was to annul the "Articles concerning the Liberty of the Churches" added to the Prussian Constitution in 1850.

It was only in 1875 that Prince Bismarck saw the necessity for it. He had before proclaimed his "war of civilization," and the first laws proposed by Minister Falk for its enforcement were passed in May, 1873. But when there was question of applying the new laws in the case of bishops or priests, these "articles" stood in the way. Consequently in April, 1875, a bill was introduced in Parliament for the abrogation of the 15th, 16th, and 18th constitutional articles, and owing to the great majority of the national *liberals* in the legislature they were directly declared to be null and void. Nothing more was required, it seems, to change the Constitution of the country, and the most despotic measures which were perhaps ever devised in a monarchy were the work of the *liberal* party. This suffices to give an idea of modern liberalism. According to the *Dublin Review*, in its number for October, 1880, "all the non-Catholic voices in Parliament, without exception—275 against 90 in the Chamber of Deputies, 69 against 42 in the Upper House—sided with the government against the Centre and the Poles."

It is important to give at least a glance at the effect produced by the Falk laws, as they were called, in order to know the whole extent of the evil. All the bishops had of course refused obedience in 1873 and 1874; but at the beginning of 1875, directly after the abolition of the constitutional articles of liberty, all the bishops and a great number of priests were already either in prison or out of their dioceses. The religious houses, which before the enactment of those laws contained 7763 women and 1237 men, were either closed or destined to gradually dwindle away and die out, owing to the obligation imposed upon them of not receiving novices. The Jesuits, of course, had been driven *en masse* from the country at the very beginning of these operations. The administration of ecclesiastical property was left entirely in the hands of laymen controlled by the state. Civil marriage was introduced at the option of the parties. The students for the holy ministry could not, according to law, be educated except in state schools.

From this moment the hard life of priests, hiding themselves from the police and pursuing their holy calling in the dark, began in Prussia, as had been the case previously in Ireland during several centuries, and in France under the Reign of Terror. The Catholic churches which had been so far open were either closed or occupied by apostate priests, called Old Catholics, who received their mission and faculties from the government. But after a while the great majority of these men—who never were more than a few dozen in the country—led such scandalous lives that the government itself refused, through shame, to advocate their candidacy

before the people. The result was the abrogation of public Catholic worship in the largest part of the country.

The Prussian Chancellor and the *liberal* party by which he was seconded in those tyrannical measures had from the beginning no other object in view than to destroy Catholicity; and they seemed to have obtained, sooner even than they hoped, as much as they intended. Prince Bismarck, however, could not but perceive that eleven millions of Catholics—some say thirteen—were now his deadly enemies, though he did not fear they should rise in insurrection against him, as the Socialists were at the moment doing. This was the main reason for which he then expressed a desire of entering into negotiations with the Vatican. But this phase of the struggle—including not only the vitality of Catholicity in Prussia, owing to the undying energy of the people, but likewise the indestructibility of the whole Church, owing to the firmness and prudence of Peter's successor—is necessarily delayed for consideration until we reach the second part of this paper, and consider the firm grounds of a hope which cannot be delusive in a near future.

To give a sufficient idea of the religious outlook in the new Germanic Empire outside of Prussia, it is proper to enumerate the various states of which it is composed. It embraces, besides Prussia itself, the kingdoms of Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Saxony; the grand duchies of Baden, Hesse, Oldenburg, and Saxe-Weimar; the duchies of Anhalt, Lippe-Detmold, Lippe-Schaumburg, Swazburg, Rudolphstadt, Sundezhhausen, and Reuss; the free cities of Lubeck, Bremen, and Hamburg; finally, Alsace-Lorraine conquered from France. This confederacy recognizes a federal legislature sitting at Berlin, and called the Reichstag; but the execution of the laws enacted in it is left to the executive power of the various states. On this account the Kulturkampf, which is generally extended to the whole confederacy, receives a different application in the different states. Thus Bavaria and Würtemberg have not broken off their communications with the Vatican, and there is a Papal nuncio residing at Munich. The bishops, all of them excellent, are able with common prudence to govern their sees, and none of them, that we know of, out of Prussia, has been exiled or sent to jail. They are, no doubt, checked and restricted in the manifestation of their zeal, and they are far from being entirely free in their efforts in behalf of Catholic education and religious ministrations. Still they possess the essential authority belonging to the divine character of their mission, and the Kulturkampf has not been imposed upon them with all the rigor of statecraft. The same is true, we believe, of Protestant Baden, of Saxony, whose king is a Catholic, and of several other minor states.

Owing to this comparative freedom of the bishops the priests

have not been disturbed in their labor for their flocks; and the schism of Old Catholicism, as it is called, has scarcely invaded those countries. One church, however, has been given them in Munich, and a few others in some of the minor states.

This leniency has been partly due to the rulers, who, merely for the sake of peace, were not disposed, in adopting the harsh policy of Bismarck, to excite a religious war in the midst of their dominions. They were every-day witnesses of the constant troubles the ardent Chancellor had brought upon himself, and they preferred to let the May laws sleep quietly in the territory which they governed. But a more powerful cause still for producing this good effect was the firm attachment to their religion professed in general by the German Catholics, outside of Prussia as well as in Prussia itself. This will be the subject of some peculiar remarks when we consider the hopeful aspect of this question, in the second part of this paper.

b. In Switzerland an almost open persecution of the Church was adopted to a great extent even before the name of Kulturkampf was known, and this country deserves to be considered apart. Peace had generally prevailed between the Protestant and Catholic cantons, even after the social convulsions of the sixteenth century, owing to the state rights acknowledged under the old Federal Constitution. The cantons, indeed, were no more homogeneous in religion, but every one of them was allowed to regulate its temporal and spiritual affairs without any interference from the General Government, which was truly federal and not centralized. The intrigues and military oppression of the French at the end of last century, whose main object was to establish a central despotism in Switzerland, as was the case in the French Republic, and the protracted efforts of Napoleon I. in the same direction throughout his reign, failed at last at his downfall in 1814; and in the general settlement of European affairs at the Congress of Vienna, "the confederacy was declared to embrace all the cantons . . . on an equal footing, which effectually excluded the unjust principle that one state should be subjected to another state." (Alison, *History of Europe*.)

But after the revolution of 1830 in France, Switzerland became the refuge of all the revolutionists who, before long, could no more remain in their native countries, owing to the severe measures adopted against them in France by Casimir Perier, Guizot, and Thiers, and by the statesmen who directed the affairs of Germany and Italy. Henceforth German, French, and Italian radicals flocked to Switzerland, and soon began to meddle with the politics of this country. The Protestant cantons, particularly Berne and Argovia, were already drifting toward a central despotism, whilst the Catholic cantons remained always firm in the old doctrine of

state rights. In that diminutive country the main feature of modern history in Europe, namely, the tendency of heresy and infidelity toward a crushing absolutism, and that of Catholicity toward a fair amount of political freedom, became at once manifest and remains so to this day. On this account the foreign radicals in Switzerland, all more or less imbued with the despotic spirit of Jacobinism, sided with the Protestant cantons, chiefly with Berne and Argovia, in whose counsels the determination prevailed of subjecting the Catholic states to their yoke.

Argovia began the religious war by the suppression of convents within its limits. As a reprisal the Catholic canton of Lucerne called openly the Jesuits to give public instruction to young men within its territory. Radicalism increasing in rage a league of the Protestants necessitated a similar measure on the part of the Catholic cantons; and in May, 1846, the bold mountaineers arbores the flag of the *Sunderbund*. Civil war ensued; and in November, 1847, Lucerne was taken by the radicals with the connivance of England, and the open oppression of the minor states by a despotic central government was the result of this complete revolution. The *Kulturkampf*, though not yet invented by M. de Bismarck, was inaugurated in unhappy Switzerland, because the federal—or rather the centralized—legislature imposed on the Church laws which were directly opposed to the supremacy of the Holy See and to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Catholic bishops. All these facts are given *in extenso* by Alison in his *History of Europe* from 1815 to 1852.

It was, however, only from 1873 that the burden became intolerable for the Catholics, because, the Falk laws having consecrated the system in Germany, the Swiss radicals felt powerful enough to go as far as the central omnipotence could go, their audacity being supported by the example of the bold Prussian Chancellor.

Thenceforth all the tyranny of vulgar legislators was exerted in Switzerland with more impudence still than in Prussia. Bishops were exiled, ecclesiastical property confiscated, priests persecuted, the churches taken forcibly from the Catholics, under the pretext of an election by the parishioners, when a dozen or so of refractory Catholics had taken the liberty of giving over the parish to an apostate pastor. Prince Bismarck, at least, had to listen to the remonstrances of sincere Catholic deputies in his parliament; but the autocrats of Geneva and Berne could act shamelessly without being subjected to the same ordeal. It was in these two cities principally that the most violent measures of oppression were enacted as laws. The Catholics of Geneva had to bear the yoke imposed upon them by Calvinists or open infidels; whilst those of the Jura included in the canton of Berne were subjected to a still

worse treatment by the Bernese legislators, or rather tyrants. Nor were the smaller Catholic cantons exempt from the encroachments of the central legislature on their natural rights, whilst in general all the Protestant cantons, particularly those of Zurich, Argovia, and Basle, openly adopted the doctrine of the Kulturkampf, and everywhere imposed on the Catholic population within their territories the burden of supporting, at their expense, a set of Old Catholic mercenary priests guilty of every moral or social excess.

These outrages at last became intolerable; and the conduct of the pretended pastors appointed by the government became so scandalous, that the public authorities were at last ashamed of the wolves to whom they had given as a prey the Catholic flocks. Bigamy, concubinage, open robbery, violence going occasionally as far as murder, were of frequent occurrence among the new clergy. In consequence of it from 1877 down to this day many of them were ignominiously deprived of their charge, and some would have had to answer before the public courts for their misdeeds had they not fled in time and eluded the pursuit of the police. Meanwhile the pretended Bishop Herzog, consecrated by the Jansenist Reinkens, labored more for the destruction of Catholicity than for the reform of his subordinate clergymen. This is at this hour the deplorable outlook of religion in Switzerland.

c. England and her European dependencies is the next subject of inquiry. Since the Catholic Emancipation in 1829, the Church has been left almost entirely to her own natural and autonomous development; and if the government has not favored her, at least in general it has left her free. On several occasions, it is true, some British statesmen have inclined to restrict her freedom, particularly on the re-establishment of the regular hierarchy by Pius IX. The question of education has also several times been agitated in a sense hostile to her claims; and it was sometimes doubtful if the remonstrances of the bishops would be listened to. But on all those occasions good sense and justice at last prevailed; and, though the Crown's supremacy is now more than ever maintained with regard to the Church established by law, the state pretensions of many European governments towards the Catholic Church or the dissident sects have never been advocated in England. The Kulturkampf is altogether ignored, and the most fanatical Protestant Englishman would ridicule the idea of the British premier ruling the Catholic bishops *in spiritualibus*, though a lay Court of Arches may impose a new liturgy and a new creed on submissive Anglican prelates.

On account of this remarkable policy all liberal-minded men can congratulate the rulers of England; they are consistent in their theories of government, and whenever there is any defect of logic

in their rule, it is, in general, favorable to liberty. The Church derives an immense advantage from it, and the example they give is beneficial even outside of the British Empire, since it is undoubtedly from the same spirit of fairness and equity that the United States have adopted and invariably applied the same rule of action toward Church discipline and Church government.

Still at this moment, if British power continues the same, it is manifest that the British mind is not so favorable to Catholicity as it was thirty years ago, and some serious danger may be the consequence in the near future. This assertion may appear questionable to many, but a few reflections will suffice to prove its correctness.

It seems, at first sight, that, on the contrary, there is now more liberality than there ever was in the British mind toward the Church, owing to the remarkable decomposition of all Protestant creeds, which is now going on with an ever-increasing rapidity. This, however, is delusive, as shall soon be seen. As long as Protestantism was considered the highest exponent of Christianity and truth, the Catholic Church was not only despised but hated. The higher classes felt for her only contempt; the lower, abhorrence and aversion. The first were always ready to enact laws against her; the second to rise in insurrection and destroy her convents and churches.

Forty years ago, on the contrary, a new era began, foreboding a universal reaction in favor of Catholicity. A serious inquiry into her claims brought conviction to a great number of noble minds. The movement originated from Oxford, but it soon spread all over England. It was hailed by Catholics throughout the world. Confraternities were established everywhere for the conversion of Great Britain, and it was firmly believed by many holy people that this great blessing was as sure as it seemed near. A few years would suffice to effect it. Still at this moment it is as far off as ever. Individual conversions, no doubt, are occasionally recorded, but with much less frequency, and altogether incapable of suggesting a hope of universality. How can all this be accounted for?

If nearly half a century ago a great number of men distinguished for their talents, virtues, or high standing in society returned to the Church of their fathers, there is no doubt in my mind that the chief cause after the grace of God was their firm adherence from their youth to the numerous truths preserved still in Protestantism. They had all their life recited with faith the Athanasian creed, they were convinced of the action of God on the human soul through grace in the sacraments, they had not renounced the tradition of the Fathers, and all their hesitation on the subject consisted in the precise limit of patristic authority during the down-

ward course of ages, etc. A sincere inquiry starting from these premises was sure to bring them into the loving bosom of the true Church. And the position they thus occupied in the religious world was not limited to a few of them. It can be maintained that it was then the state of the British mind, at least among the thoroughly educated classes of the nation. The High Church party, as it was called, embraced a great number of the most ardent and sincere students of Christian antiquity. If there was still a class of fanatical opponents, none of them could be said to belong to the leaders of thought at that epoch. And this was not confined to clergymen. Many laymen inclined the same way, and conversions among them took place. This was so remarkable that the report of it throughout Europe took a tinge of exaggeration. M. Gondou, who then wrote in France many books and review articles on this subject, went so far as to assert on many occasions that, religiously speaking, Great Britain was divided into three equal parts, namely, Anglicans, Protestant dissidents, and Catholics. Unfortunately this was not true, and the members of the true Church were far from including one-third of the British population. Still the very fact of this false rumor proves how rapid was then the progress of Catholic ideas. It was also at that moment that many Anglicans refused to bear the name of Protestants, and called themselves Catholics. Meanwhile, in the midst of the excitement produced by these occurrences, the number of infidels, atheists, and positivists was so insignificant that nobody spoke of them; and if there was already some attempt made in England to introduce into religious questions the destructive criticism which was already in full sway in Germany, no one paid attention to it, because no one could foresee that it was destined in a short time to prevail. Great Britain was reviving to the consciousness of her former Catholicism, and on the point of forgetting entirely the spirit of Erastianism and naturalism which a recent epoch had witnessed during the latter part of the last century.

Is this still the case at this moment? Just the reverse. Nearly all the books, Review articles, and philosophical or theological papers published at this day, treat of a single fact, either to hail it as a blessing or to rebuke it mildly and with great reserve. This fact is the almost incredible spread of anti-Christian ideas. There is no more question of Great Britain returning to Catholicism, but the almost only prospect in view is her rapid decline toward the abyss of complete unbelief. Read the ardent protestations of those who have yet some faith and wish to keep it; go over the despairing predictions of some of the best minds in England; peruse even the lines in which the upholders of the new doctrines deplore occasionally the total loss of their belief in the supernatural, and say if

it is possible to conceive a more hopeless religious state. This is not the work only of laymen, either scientists like Tyndall and Huxley, or *littérateurs* like Matthew Arnold and George Eliot; but even Anglican clergymen join in the unholy crusade, and preach a Christianity deprived of basis and sanction. A British bishop has openly attacked the Pentateuch, and the Gospels begin to be nursery tales for many pastors of souls and preachers of morality.

There is, however, a remarkable feature which seems to redeem to a certain degree the hopelessness of the situation. This is the numerous class of Ritualists who in appearance carry their belief farther than the Catholic Church, and adopt rites of the most sumptuous and typical character. But rejecting, as they do, the principle of authority in all its degrees, the fire they think they have kindled is made only of stubble and straw, and the British mind cannot be affected by a senseless superstition, since it is nothing else. The British mind, therefore, is at this moment being de-Christianized, and on the eve of losing the last remnant of its former faith. If this process of religious disorganization was to be carried to its last phase, can any one think that the Catholic Church would be left quiet and remain free in England? The *Westminster Review* has more than once advocated several years ago the open persecution of the Roman Church; its call for restrictions, penalties, or at least the slavery of silence would no doubt become the universal doctrine of new statesmen and rulers.

d. The Scandinavian states—chiefly Norway and Sweden—offer an exception, in the religious outlook, from the other Protestant states of Germany. It is known that until quite recently the Catholics, lying under the most complete disabilities and subjected to the severest penal code, had not the least possibility of preserving their faith. The Catholic Church, in fact, had entirely disappeared from the country. It was only toward 1870 that a liberal legislature granted to the dissidents from Lutheranism the right to proselytize and even to exist. Rome has at last been able to send thither an apostolic vicar, and there are already several congregations enjoying the full liberty of religion. The state worship is Lutheran, but it is the nearest to the Catholic of all Protestant creeds. When a Swede or a Norwegian wishes to return to the Church, auricular confession, the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the belief in purgatory and consequently prayer for the dead, etc., offer to him no difficulty whatever. The only thing of importance he has to learn is the constitution of the Church and the authority of the Roman Pontiff, to which even he feels inclined, because he has been brought up in the conviction that the Church of Christ enjoys the prerogative of teaching in spiritual matters, and he believes that a Christian must obey the injunctions of his legitimate pastors.

There are consequently no dark spots with regard to the future in Scandinavia, but rather symptoms of hope; and it must be remarked that Norway shows herself more liberal still than Sweden in all these particulars.

2. The religious outlook in Austria and the so-called Latin nations calls now our attention, though the description must be brief and therefore inadequate.

a. The Austrian Empire has been, since the attempt at revolution in 1848, ruled by administrations more or less opposed to the Church; and there has been a moment when some system like the Prussian Kulturkampf might have been imposed on the nation if the emperor had not used all his power to prevent it. Soon after quelling the rebellion of 1848—with the help of Russia as is well known—the young emperor, Francis Joseph, who ascended the throne after the abdication of his father, felt the necessity of giving more strength to the religious element, and in 1855 a concordat with Rome placed the Church in a far better condition than she had been in for a long time. Josephism was thereby dead, and its revival has not been attempted ever since. But the revolution was always at work, and it took in Austria the form of Germanism, called emphatically centralization, which, by placing all institutions, even those of religion, in the hands of the state, would have brought back Josephism in a still worse form than formerly. This was evidently the object of Count Beust, who, to the surprise of all conservatives, was called from Prussia and placed at the head of the cabinet. He came when the new agreement with Rome was in full vigor, and had already produced abundant fruits.

By this concordat the *placitum regium* was abrogated. The bishops were declared free in their relations with the Holy See, with their brethren of the episcopate, and with their own flocks as to spiritual direction. The religious education of children and young men was placed under their supervision. The teaching of theology and cognate sciences, the discipline of the clergy, the nomination to benefices, etc., were declared to belong to bishops alone. Many other regulations of a like character were agreed to. It is sufficient for Americans to know that, with the exception of the nomination of bishops and some other minor points, the Church was placed in Austria nearly on the same footing as it is in the United States, where, thank God, all church organizations are perfectly free in the management of their own affairs.

But this did not suit Count Beust any more than his friend, Chancellor Bismarck in Prussia. Consequently, in 1870, directly after the declaration of Papal infallibility by the Council of the Vatican, the *Official Journal* of Vienna published the following note: "In consequence of the definition of the dogma of infallibility,

the government has resolved no longer to maintain the concordat with Rome, which will, therefore, cease to be valid. The Chancellor of the Empire has consequently taken steps to notify the Roman Curia of the formal abrogation of the concordat," etc.

M. Beust did not see any greater difficulty than this in declaring null and void a solemn treaty concluded after long and serious negotiations between two great powers. But his reason was absolutely the same as that of Prince Bismarck,—the reader remembers it,—and this sufficed to take away at once from the Church the freedom necessary for its existence, which the state in this country acknowledges with good sense and fairness.

Henceforth it seemed that Josephism would revive worse than ever, because it would take even in Austria the brutal form of the *Kulturkampf* which Bismarck was then at the moment of inaugurating in Prussia. Fortunately the young emperor, who was far from having lost his faith, and possessed still some power, owing to the affection of the people for him, interposed his authority; and a few months after the savage declaration of Count Beust in his *Official Journal* we read in the *London Tablet* of the 28th of January, 1871: "Much as the Church has suffered in Austria, the breaches made in her walls . . . have not been so great as in other Catholic kingdoms invaded by the revolutionary spirit. 1. The Masonic lodges have never been able to obtain a legal recognition in the empire. 2. No convent has been suppressed from Joseph II.'s time to the present day. 3. No churches or monasteries have been robbed of their possessions. 4. The Jesuits still teach publicly even in the universities. 5. The *Placet* does not exist there. 6. Civil marriage is not made obligatory. . . . 7. In all the schools a priest enjoys a post of authority. 8. No bishop or priest has as yet been imprisoned for any act of his ecclesiastical authority."

We believe that all this is true of Austria, even at the present day. Nay, more; M. Taaffe, the present Prime Minister, does his best at this moment to decentralize the administration of affairs, so that the Bohemian or Czech deputies, all strongly Catholics, have lately taken their seats in the Federal Parliament at Vienna, and thus Austrian politics have entered into a new phase favorable to the Church. There is, of course, an outcry of indignation in the liberal ranks, and yesterday, November 17th, 1880, a New York paper has predicted that the Taaffe ministry would soon fall! We think this prediction will not be verified, because the new policy of the administration is the only means of saving the empire, and the spirit of Germanism which is directly opposed to it would be sure to bring on a total decomposition of the body politic.

b. In France the present prospect looks far gloomier still than

it did last July, when a paper was published in this REVIEW on "Public Education in France and the Ferry Bill." The bill itself was defeated in the Senate, and the right of existing and teaching on the part of unauthorized congregations seemed secure. But during the recess of the Chambers several ministerial *decrees* based on former autocratic and revolutionary laws, which everybody thought obsolete, but which were supposed still in force by the administration, were issued without consulting the legislature. On the strength of these decrees the Jesuits were first forcibly expelled from their houses and denied the right of living in community; and during the month of October last other religious congregations of men were dispersed with a still greater degree of acerbity and harshness. At this moment the Chambers have met, and the open discussion of these deplorable facts has begun. The lower branch of the legislature is strongly radical, the Senate nearly equally divided, and it is to be feared that the laws which M. Ferry, now Prime Minister, is at this very time proposing for adoption, may be voted by a slight majority in the Senate. It is, however, doubtful if the ministers can be sustained. They had already presented their resignation a few weeks ago, and many think that their fall is sure and imminent.

This recrudescence of animosity against the Church is highly fomented by the Communist party, whose chief aim is the total destruction of society as it now exists. At the same time that the Jesuits were dispersed the convicted felons of the rabid Commune, who, in 1871, tried to burn Paris and murdered the "hostages,"—one of whom was the Archbishop of Paris,—were granted a complete amnesty and returned in triumph from New Caledonia. They now are calling for vengeance on those who convicted and exiled them. The vile papers in which they exhale their fury exceed, it seems, in violence the maniac ranting and bloodthirsty appeals of a Marat and a Hebert in 1793. Still the government is afraid of them, and does not dare to call them before the courts. Nay, the courts of justice themselves are wantonly disorganized by a blind administration, and all the magistrates who have still some self-respect are now tendering their resignation rather than be the tools of a Cazot and a Constans. These resignations are at this moment counted by many hundreds, and, thank God, the legists at least have been forced to side openly with the Church and Christian order. Their noble advocacy of the right of religious to live together and follow their rules had never, that I know, been so open and outspoken in France, and this is a redeeming feature of great weight and importance in that unhappy country.

From all appearances the actual government will not be able to

stand in front of the rebellious crew by which they are hounded on, and compelled to adopt every day radical measures, which they had stoutly denied the day before. To speak plainly, the outlook at this moment is that of gaunt anarchy. This, however, cannot last long, and we will give further on our reasons for hoping against hope. This will only have been a new trial of republican institutions, which glaringly appear for the third time radically unsuited for France and opposed to the leanings of the nation. What kind of monarchy must be their last resource is not a question to be discussed in these pages.

c. In Italy the political and social state of the country seems to be rapidly drifting toward the same excesses as in France, though not in the same virulent form. The king is nobody, so that even in common parlance it is said that "under Victor Emmanuel every one knew that Humbert would be his successor, whilst to-day no one pretends to know who will succeed Humbert." The administration is in the hands of "men of the Left," that is, of radicals; the legislature is nearly in accordance with the ministry, though it seems they begin to be tired of sitting in Rome, and would wish a more pleasant city to live in. Some conclude that Rome might soon revert to the Pope, but this seems to be a too sanguine expectation. The ruling classes, in fact, are firm believers in the stability of the *Unita Italiana*, and as this rests entirely on robbery and spoliation, it is not very likely that they are in favor of giving back to the Church even a slight morsel of her former dominions. To thoroughly know the rottenness of this part of the population one has only to reflect a moment on the disgraceful triumph of Garibaldi in Milan, which occurred only a few weeks ago.

This is rather a gloomy outlook; still it is not possible to convey a sufficient idea of it in a short paragraph such as the one which has just been written. The secret societies, however, which have in modern times swarmed in that restless country, have not been even mentioned. And every one must acknowledge that if there is a sore spot in beautiful Italy, it is to be found in the numberless sects of conspirators who have been the real cause of all the recent changes and revolutions.

It is said, it is true, that the Freemasons of the 'Great Orient Order, who for a long time have had the underground management of the main political plots and social intrigues, have no more the ruling power in their hands; and one of the best known among them, who recently died at Leghorn, bitterly complained in his last malady that the *influential* lodges were no more the seat of respectability and gentility, but had been replaced by other associations of a more plebeian cast. This, it seems, is very true; and Freemasonry, which until lately recruited its members from the

higher or middle classes, has lately made a mighty step downwards, and has received within its folds rude proletarians whose main object is to supplant the former more refined Masons in the government of the world. There is, no doubt, in this great fact a symptom of hope for good men, because if Freemasonry is divided its efficiency is nearly gone, according to the homely proverb, "When rogues disagree honest people can enjoy their own." But it must be considered that the substitution of plebeians for aristocrats in secret societies may bring on the reign of the mob, as it did in France during the first revolution, when the *Jacobin Society* became the great ruling power and brought about what was pointedly called the Reign of Terror. The effective remedy for the evils of Italy cannot be found in the formation of political clubs composed of the dregs of society, and from which nothing can be expected but disorder and anarchy. It has just been said also that there is scarcely any ground for hoping that the educated men who have been so far the leaders in the recent revolutions, and have robbed pontiffs and princes in order to set up their fictitious *unity*, will finally open their eyes, and, feeling at last the importance of religion for the preservation of order, will act more fairly toward the Church, and stop at once the process of spoliation which is still going on even at this moment. We think the true remedy lies in the firm union and strong determination of all sincere Catholics, as will soon be pointed out.

In Spain religion seems to be, if anything, more prostrated still than in Italy. It would require a long historical dissertation to place before Americans the true causes of so strange a phenomenon. Many persons in this country cannot possibly understand how a nation so strongly Catholic a hundred years ago is now a prey, not only to dissent from the Church, but to the wild theories of infidelity, materialism, and positivism, which at this day are far from being confined to Germany, France, and England. To render it plain to every understanding, we would have to unfold the spread of Jansenism a hundred years ago among many of the clergy and some of the laity. At the same time it would be necessary to show how the rankest unbelief was communicated from France to the highest ranks in the Spanish political world, in fact to all the ministers and diplomatic agents of Spanish kings. It would be afterwards proper to prove that Spain became the slave of France during the whole time of the first revolution and the reign of Napoleon I., and could not but receive a large dose of the moral virus which was consuming the country north of the Pyrenees. The tramping of French and English soldiers during so many years over the devoted soil of the Iberian peninsula, and the bitter

quarrels of the nation with Ferdinand VII. after he came back, were not calculated to strengthen the Christian feeling, chiefly owing to the wild revolutionary theories which everywhere prevailed during the contest between the king and his subjects. But more, perhaps, than anything else, the spread of the French language and of infidel books, written last century, but good enough for Spaniards of this, was the pernicious source of the widespread disorder which is to-day witnessed in Spain. It is known that under the Bourbons, from 1815 to 1830, and later, all the former editions of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, etc., which had become unsalable in France, were packed in enormous bales and carted across the Pyrenees for the enlightenment of the Spaniards. Modern editions of the same authors soon came out in great numbers and soon found their way in the same direction.

All these causes of demoralization would have to be unfolded in detail to fully explain the present state of a country whose name was once equivalent to those of chivalry and Catholicism; but we must be satisfied with this short paragraph on so important a subject.

At this moment, undoubtedly, Spain is in better hands than she has been for a long time. The present king, Alfonso XII., is well disposed toward the Church. Not only the relations with the Vatican, which had been previously broken off, have been resumed, but there is at this moment such an exchange of courtesies between the kingly family and the Pope that on reading in the papers the details of them one might fancy he is perusing a page of Spanish history dating from at least two centuries back. This, however, is delusive. Secret societies continue plotting. Deputies, journalists, writers of books, even many men employed by a blind administration, are openly at work for some new scheme or other. Even it seems that at this moment the country is on the eve of a new explosion. The following is a startling paragraph which I read in the number for August 8th, 1880, of *La Civilizacion*, one of the best Catholic reviews published in Madrid. The title of the article is "El Despertamiento de España Catolica."

"We would wish that all Catholics should well know the gravity of the circumstances in which they are placed, and should prepare themselves for events which are evidently preparing. Since one of the first duties is the sacred right of self-defence, we would suggest to them that in place of their usual pastime they should attend to army drill and shooting at a target as an exercise. We would not be sorry if, following the former example of St. Olozaga, they should bring back the fashion of wearing a sword,—*llevar espada en el cinto*,—after of course obtaining a license from the public authorities. . . . We would be rather pleased, in fine, if the Catholics

should exact a proper respect for their persons, and remind the revolutionists that if they are always bold against cowards, they are invariably the personification of cowardice in front of a brave man."

If this is a startling passage of a sober Catholic review, calculated to give a painful idea of Spain, it at least proves that the Catholics intend to secure their rights.

A terrible war is, therefore, raging all over Europe between what is called the revolution on one side and the Church on the other. The governments themselves are all more or less led by the revolutionary principles which have at last penetrated them, and imposed upon the sovereigns—let them be kings or presidents—the task of carrying out its programme. This programme is first and foremost the *Kulturkampf*, whose satanic object has been sufficiently explained. In this warfare we can distinguish the fields of politics, of sociology, of intellect, of morality, of popular well-being. Under all these aspects the Church is violently opposed. Her adversaries pretend that they have enlisted under their standard nearly the whole of mankind as willing slaves to their theories. Still *politics* are everywhere drifting toward the rule of the mob; *social science* is mostly the denial of all the principles on which human society has so far rested; intellect is nothing else than a pretended knowledge which invariably ends in skepticism; morality has ceased to be the rule of action imposed by God's commandments, and becomes more and more every day a mere cloak thrown over a putrid rottenness; popular well-being, finally, which was the first pretext assumed for the introduction of revolutionary ideas, is altogether forgotten in the conflict, and the common people are everywhere more wretched than ever.

Hence, if a universal conflict has been proclaimed against religious law, there is in prospect a fiercer antagonism still between all the elements of the revolution itself. The various states of Europe having scornfully rejected the former right of arbitration on the part of the Holy See, and reduced to expediency the former balance of power based on treaties and international principles of right, have no other means of securing their existence than enormous armies, which consume the whole strength of empires, kingdoms, or republics. It is said that there are at this moment ten millions of men under arms in Europe. Some time ago we ourselves thought there were only seven millions. Let the reader choose between the first and the second number. But it is appalling to think of it when the frightful means of destruction which *modern science* has placed in the hands of these armies are considered. And whilst the various nationalities are thus arrayed against each other, in each of them there are political parties, secret organizations plotting in the dark, or rebellious associations working in the

open air, which threaten to subvert the whole frame of society, and reveal to the sight of the most obtuse-minded the spectre of anarchy and social decomposition.

This is the spectacle presented at this day by Europe almost in its entirety. It is important to see if there are redeeming features in it; and since this paper is confined to the religious outlook, this alone must be discussed, leaving aside the political, social, and moral decomposition of the party opposed to the Church. By a strict inquiry made into the rottenness of that party the successful issue on the Church's side would directly appear as almost imminent, and the only question which could be matter of controversy would be as to the longer or shorter time required for bringing the rebellious world to the feet of the Church, the same as happened at the destruction of the Roman Empire by the barbarians. At this moment we confine our reflections to the present day.

II. In the firm conviction of Catholics the issue of this conflict must be certain in favor of right for two reasons principally. One is derived from Christ's promise, which by itself would amply suffice: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church." The other merely rational, based however on Scripture, results from a well-established historical law which the great St. Augustine was the first to point out. In his time good Christians discussed among themselves the question of *persecutions*. It seems that many of them thought they saw in the Apocalypse the certainty that their number in the Church's life would be limited to ten only. And by closely looking into the four centuries which had already elapsed they thought they found exactly that number of persecutions. Hence they concluded that there would never be any other for all time to come. The holy bishop proved in his *De Civitate Dei* that they were mistaken. From the words of Christ, particularly from the passage of the Gospel where is contained the parable of "the tares and the wheat," he showed that persecutions would never cease—they were the normal state of the Church in her pilgrimage; but she would invariably conquer in those contests with the world and the devil, until finally in the last her triumph would be final and complete.

Ever since Augustine's time this historical law has been verified, and a remarkable proof of it was furnished directly after his death, when the Vandalic persecution in Africa was accompanied with horrible cruelties such as the Roman world had scarcely witnessed under the Pagan emperors. Still religion stood the shock. The European fiends who display at this moment their fierce hatred against Catholicity, have not yet gone so far in their madness as to repeat in our age the Vandalic horrors of bloodshedding and death. They think they are wiser by adopting the system of *Kulturkampf*.

Their expectation will be in the end frustrated, like the schemes of those who have preceded them in the same vain attempt. It is necessary to persuade ourselves of it by bringing forward the firm grounds of that hope, felt by all of us independently of the promises of Christ, and derived simply from some striking facts to which public attention is not sufficiently directed. They all concur in proving that the Church has seldom if ever been so strong intrinsically as she is at this moment, and that consequently her success is as certain as it has always been in previous ages.

The first token of unconquerable strength is the firm attitude of the modern Popes who have already succeeded each other for more than three centuries, and must continue in the same firmness of determination. During that long period of time they have first withstood the outbreak of Protestantism, beaten it back to the North of Europe, and they witness to-day its death-throes in skepticism and complete disintegration. They have seen also the absolutism of princes, Catholic or not, born from heresy and Cæsarism, turned at first against their authority and threatening even their spiritual power, but at last tottering and prostrate under the storm of democratic fury, whilst the voice of Peter's successors count still hundreds of millions of faithful listeners and obedient children. They have at last been able to cope single-handed against this many-headed monster called the revolution. Alone of all princes and potentates they have boldly refused to adopt its maxims and to worship the golden calf of the hour. What is called modern liberalism is nothing after all but the exclusion of God and His law from society; and the last expression of that system is the hatred of both God and His laws. Have not all the governments of Europe stepped down at least on the first and broad round of liberalism's ladder, standing on which religion is set aside from the state, the forum, the school, and coolly relegated within the family circle? Are not these the maxims proclaimed by all the leaders of nations except the Popes? And before long the second step must follow by the adoption of the full revolutionary doctrine which at this moment openly preaches the hatred of God and His law. Everything tends towards it in our age, and it becomes every day more probable that in spite of the efforts of less advanced liberals, Communism, Socialism, Nihilism will soon triumph over the present rulers. These would like to see the people satisfied with their *moderate* theories; but they will be disappointed, because they have fully planted and cultivated the root of the evil by proclaiming their independence from religious law.

The Popes have *not*, and they have, on the contrary, invariably declared that they are the teachers and interpreters of this divine code, to which all must submit, since it is the expression of God's

will. During the last three centuries—there is no need of going further up, since we speak here of modern times—the Popes have, perhaps, more than ever asserted that Christ's doctrine must be the rule for all nations. They cannot be conquered on this ground, because Christianity alone can heal the wounds of humanity and establish happiness on earth. The undisguised Paganism which "modern thought" is endeavoring to introduce again into society must, on the contrary, bring on such social calamities that, in the midst of their woes, the European nations at last will understand their criminal mistake, and look again for the harbor in which alone they will be able to find a refuge. Their only safety will be found again under the Pontiff's staff.

What would have been the case had the Popes listened to the solicitations of *moderate* liberals in these latter times, and given up the principle the successors of Peter have always been contending for? They would, at this moment, be as infirm of purpose as all other modern sovereigns who are now tottering to their fall. Still this surrender to liberalism has been expected from them several times during the short span of our lives. After the death of Gregory XVI., at the election of his successor, every *wise* student of the signs of the times felt sure of it. Pius IX. was a liberal and would in his policy follow the spirit of the age. But Pius IX. stultified the utterers of these prophecies, and stood as firm as any previous Pontiff. It seems that many wiseacres in Italy blundered likewise with regard to the present Pope; and a couple of *liberal* papers in that country express now their sorrow at the sudden disappearance of their hopes.

Men of mind, on the contrary, to whatever party they belong, must feel sure of the triumph of the Papacy precisely on account of this obstinacy in maintaining the principle on which the Church of Christ has always rested, which is the open declaration that God's law must rule mankind, if mankind is not destined soon to perish. And the circumstance which is most encouraging is that the Sovereign Pontiff is not unsupported in his boldness. Besides the Godlike strength which he receives from on high, his noble cause is embraced in all European countries by men of the highest intellect, the bravest heart, and the purest morality, carrying after them millions of human beings belonging to all nations. But, as this remarkable circumstance is by itself another firm ground of hope, it must be left for further development, after the figure of the Pope is again a little while considered independently of its surroundings.

Remember, O reader! that this figure is not like that of any common monarch, destined not only to die one day, but to see his dynasty swept away sooner or later in the course of time. How

many are the lines of kings which have flourished and disappeared in the various kingdoms of Europe since the beginning of our era ! The Popes alone have formed an unchangeable line of sovereigns, which have now lasted nearly nineteen centuries, and is far from being finished. For their sovereignty is not confined to the temporal power they possess when they are not forcibly deprived of it. It resides chiefly in their spiritual prerogatives, and these *cannot be stolen away* from them. As the Popedom cannot die, *a* Pope may, but *the* Pope does not, cease to exist. It was a very silly, nay, an extremely ludicrous idea of the French Jacobins, when, under the "Directoire," they sent their troops to Rome, took away Pope Pius VI., carried him to Valence in Southern France, and *helped* him there to die. They directly fancied there would never be another Pope, because they would see to it, and they were then omnipotent. A shout of exultation issued from their throats, and, I think, from the mouths of Protestants in general throughout the world, "The Papacy was dead, and would not rise from its ashes." But not longer than a year after the Russian schismatics came to Italy led by Suvaroff, and Venice being delivered from the French yoke, the cardinals met in that city and elected Pius VII., who straightway went to take possession of his capital. Who does not know that not only for the election, but even for the consecration and enthronization of a Pope, there is no city assigned? If propriety requires that all this should take place at Rome, in a case of necessity any spot is as good; and if the celebrated *Internationale*, of which nothing is now heard, should hold in its firm grasp the whole of Europe and America, there is room enough for the ceremony of Papal enthronization in Asia and Africa. If even these would be closed up, the smallest coral island of the South Sea would suffice. And after the solemn rites of consecration have been once performed, though in the darkness of new catacombs, the hundreds of millions of men who must continue to obey the Pontiff are and always will be ready to acknowledge him with joy and follow his prescriptions as those of Christ.

This brings on naturally the consideration of a second ground of hope, namely, the perfect coherence and unity of all the leaders among the Pope's subjects, and these are the Catholic bishops of the Universal Church. In a normal state of affairs the patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops of every degree, are surrounded with pomp. They officiate in gorgeous cathedrals, in which all the splendor of the fine arts is displayed. The solemnities over which they preside have never been excelled in the palaces of kings, and the multitude of adorers, high and low, rich and poor, form around their prelates a retinue which has been justly compared to the high court of Heaven. But in case Antichrist should come to reign

on earth, and his innumerable army of barbarians should at once devastate what it has cost centuries to build up; in case, as was said of Jerusalem, the ways of Sion should mourn and her solemnities be at an end, and all her gates should be broken down, and her priests sigh, and her virgins be plunged into affliction; still bishops should remain to continue their ministrations and govern, with the Pope at their head, a Church "oppressed with bitterness" (Lam. i. 4). "The beauty of the king's daughter is interior," and the graces that she bestows on mankind do not depend on exterior display. Her bishops can teach men though multitudes should no more surround their chair. They can bring down the Holy Ghost from Heaven, and distribute His gifts to the faithful in the solitude of the desert. They can ordain priests and other ministers of the altar without any witness to the ceremony.

Their efficiency is chiefly derived from their union with the chief pastor. When this is loose the Church is weak; when it is compact she is strong. In the first case heresies arise, and there is division and schism, as frequently happened in the fourth and fifth centuries when there were so many Arian, and Nestorian, and Eutychian, and Monothelite bishops. This is to-day well-nigh impossible, as was proved at the Council of the Vatican. In the discussions of doctrine previous to the definitions bishops differed, and there were opportunists and inopportunists, etc. As soon as the decrees were passed, all agreed and said that the Holy Ghost had spoken. Since that time they all have returned to their dioceses, and every one is bound to admire, not only their unanimity in maintaining the faith, but likewise their constancy in suffering for the Church in all those countries where the storm of persecution rages.

There is, however, one circumstance which must be remarked here, and of which no word has yet been said. In Germany, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Italy, or Spain, whenever the hierarchy is attacked and persecuted by the civil power, not only the Pope, though himself a prisoner, takes immediately the defence of the bishops, and the whole world hears his protestations, remonstrances, and threats of censure; but the bishops on their part never fail in dubious cases to consult the Holy See with regard to the conduct they must follow in their conflict with the state. This has been done several times in Germany, in Belgium quite lately, in Switzerland on many occasions, in France during the whole contest about education. And it is everywhere understood that though the Pope takes no conclusive decision without having consulted and heard the bishops, still should his final determination be different from theirs, it would immediately be unanimously adopted. Yet in this last case the Pope's infallibility is in no way concerned, and it is only

his advisory direction which is obeyed. It is evident that this has never before been the case in the Church to the same extent, and this alone gives her a strength which must triumph over all her enemies; for with such a unity as this no opposing force can prevail.

From the beginning of Christianity till these latter days this could not have been even imagined. It was always understood that in the case of a papal decision of any kind, there would always be dissentient bishops; and this was declared by all theologians to be no derogation to the Church's unity. This essential mark of Catholicity, which has always been considered the most powerful factor in its efficiency and power, is, therefore, more compact and solid at this time than in any previous age, and becomes the sure warrant of an invincible vigor, stronger still than the one which, to the knowledge of all, has resisted so far the numberless shocks of the most brutal violence.

Look a moment at these bishops of Prussia and Switzerland, all exiles from their sees or immured in state prisons with the vilest criminals, still consoled by the approval, not only of God and their conscience, but also by the open praise bestowed upon them by the Vicar of Christ, and say if the working of an odious Kulturkampf against them has in the least broken down their strength and shortened their power. It seems so to men who pay attention only to the outlook, that is, to the mere surface. To be convinced of the contrary it suffices to give but a glance at their obedient flocks, at those German and Swiss Catholics who scornfully reject the bribes of the state, and recognize as their spiritual rulers those only whom the Pope acknowledges, and who have been taken away from them. Their affection is strongest because these friends of their souls are absent and suffering; their obedience is the more submissive because the directions they can receive from them are more scanty and difficult. But this attitude of the Catholic people will soon be presented apart as another firm ground of a hope which cannot be delusive and ineffectual.

Turn again your eyes towards the bishops of France and Belgium, subjected at this moment with their clergy to the attacks of the mob which in both countries has taken hold of the reins of government. They are neither in exile nor in jail, but they are threatened with both, nay, with death itself, by the vile Jacobin clubs which openly aspire to replace at the head of the state the more lucky radicals who have by the strangest of chances become the rulers of the hour. It is a medley of sects and parties, in which it is difficult to know who is at the head or at the tail. Anarchy, if not yet let loose, is nevertheless prominent in the picture. Who can pretend that the hierarchy is not at this moment the strongest power in the eyes of sensible Frenchmen and of Belgians? Among

them alone is there unity of purpose and nobleness of aim. The Gallic mind in both countries is not yet besotted; and men of little faith belonging to that race, who now appear indifferent and lukewarm, must before long open at last their eyes and distinguish between the true and the beautiful on one side, and the false and hideous on the other. This is undoubtedly the most rational view of the present prospect, unless God wishes again to thoroughly chastise that fickle race and bring it through the excess of misery to the stool of repentance and amendment. One thing is certain, the religious outlook, if appalling, is in reality full of a promise, which may be deferred a short time, but must end in a happy realization.

In Germany outside of Prussia the bishops, if not actually the prey of the same violent storms, have been chastened and purified by the imminence of danger. In Bavaria, Saxony, Württemberg, Baden, and other smaller states, as well as in the whole Austrian Empire, not only there is no more among them Erastianism and Josephism, but the devotedness to the Holy See, the strict attention to pastoral duty on the part of the bishops, is the same as everywhere else in Europe. Nothing more can be said of this part of Christendom, which forms no exception to the picture of strength described a few paragraphs back.

As to the Spanish Episcopate a word must suffice. Under the rule of Alfonso XII. the bishops have recovered at least their essential rights, and they are now free with regard to Christian education; and the governments easily consent to the restoration and extension of religious orders. There are, no doubt, in the country, as was seen, powerful elements of disorder, chiefly owing to the universal spread of secret societies, through which, not only infidelity but its chief outcomes in this age, namely, Socialism and Communism, are unfortunately prevalent in the ruling classes. Nevertheless with an Episcopate firmly attached to the Holy See, as is the case, those monsters must give way and gradually disappear. Already among the progressists themselves there is an open disapproval of the present excesses of the French radicals. It is to be hoped that the Providence of God will suscite among Spanish bishops great men intellectually and socially. They will find to help them the common people, who are sound at the core, and it will be possible for them, if they are once admitted into the councils of the nation, to cure the greatest evil of the state, which it seems is a widespread corruption extending through all the branches of the civil administration. Former Spanish bishops have performed a greater wonder still when in the seventeen celebrated councils of Toledo they have reformed at the same time the Church and civil society, after giving the last blow to Arian-

ism and its cognate errors. Let us hope and pray that no new senseless and criminal revolution will break out in Spain to delay still longer the realization of this great boon.

In Italy the Episcopate partakes of the sorrows of the Holy Father, and of the open attacks to which his authority is subjected. They witness the inroads of all the worst principles and maxims of the revolutionary programme. This is chiefly visible in the almost total destruction of religious houses and in the godless education which is openly prepared for Italian youth. But there is still more unanimity among these bishops than in any other country, and a more heartfelt attachment to the Head of the Church, whom they surround more closely and whom they know better through a nearer and more familiar intercourse. With the Pope they stand or fall, since they are only his vanguard and retinue. This suffices to know that they must with their chief overcome the disorganized enemies by whom they are surrounded. There is no greater power against them than the intricate web of secret societies which have tyrannized over Italy since the beginning of this century. But, as was seen, their tremendous sway is now breaking down through disunion in their ranks. The Catholic spirit is reviving among the people. Of both these grounds of hope the *Civiltà Cattolica* is the voucher in its last numbers; and no one can refuse to acknowledge that this periodical has been for a long time and is now the best informed on Italian affairs.

The third motive of not despairing which the spectacle of the Church offers at this moment is derived from the actual state of the clergy, both regular and secular. After the Popedom and the hierarchy this is, and has always been, the greatest element of strength in the Church. With good bishops and good priests she is unconquerable. Whenever she has lost some of her influence, owing to interior abuses, she has invariably reconquered it in full as soon as the militia of her clergy has recovered its natural discipline. Can any one, by perusing the annals of our holy religion, find ever a better one than in this restless and disordered age?

The regular battalion, it is true, seems to have been effectually routed and disorganized in many countries; still it has never been in reality so full of life and true courage. To destroy, nay, annihilate it, the European governments, blindly siding with their worst enemies,—the radical revolutionists,—have nearly everywhere exerted all their power to sweep it out of existence. In this act of madness the so-called Catholic powers have surpassed the Protestant states. If among these last Prussia has driven the religious orders out of its territory by a single decree, England has not touched them, and the Scandinavian states begin to again welcome them. But ponder on what is being done at this moment against

them in Catholic France and in Papal Italy. Remember what has taken place in Spain a few years ago. The skill of politicians, the deep thoughts of statesmen, the blending of knavery with hypocrisy, all the resources of the wisdom of this world, have been employed to produce a sudden and fatal effect against religious orders. Bismarck has forgotten the Socialists to fall on Jesuits and Redemptorists. French Ministers of State, blinder still than the Prussian Chancellor, break open the doors of Capuchins and Dominicans to send them adrift, whilst they bring back from Noumea the former conspirators of the Commune, and sign their own death warrant by introducing on the political stage the mad Jacobins who openly clamor for the blood of their very liberators. The history of Spain and Italy during the last fifteen years could furnish examples nearly as striking as these of aberration of mind produced by the fury of hatred.

But space does not allow us to describe in full the scenes of this ludicrous comedy in France, which unfortunately may end in the most bloody and hideous tragedy. The only question to be considered here is, Will those madmen succeed, and destroy at last the *bataillon sacré* of the Catholic Church? We say that they render it stronger, and that it must triumph over them in the end. There is but one way of abolishing religious orders, and that is by a decree of the Pope, who alone has supreme authority over them. The harshest measures taken by legislators, princes, or the mob end in nothing but the thorough reformation of regulars, and consequently in a renewal of strength and efficiency. Look at the bloody persecution inaugurated by the French revolutionists of 1793. They appeared to have more fully succeeded than the worst enemies of the Church had ever before. The religious orders were swept away from France as if by the besom of destruction. The inmates of the houses in which great abuses had crept accepted the decrees of dissolution with an unnatural joy, and never thought of resuming their habit or rule even when the times became more favorable. The religious—male or female—who had continued in fervor, and left their houses most unwillingly, were subjected afterwards to such an unheard-of tyranny that even those who escaped the guillotine or death in jail could not imagine that they would ever be able to resume their former life. Still, when the actual persecution by Ferry and his compeers began, it was estimated that the female religious in France were more than double in number compared to those of last century, and if the religious men do not present at this moment such a large array as formerly, they are much more efficient, because more zealous and learned.

The execution of the actual French *decrees* will temporarily inconvenience those who have been subjected to them. They can-

not, however, consider themselves as free from their vows; and even if the Commune should come to inflict heavier afflictions on them, the day will not be far off when liberty will finally be granted. The deep affection manifested in their regard by all classes of society at the hour of their dispersion, will break out with more power on the day of their deliverance; and who can say what they will not be able to do when, order being at last restored, they will return to their houses and to the open pursuit of their holy vocation? Before the attempt to disperse them was made it appeared easy to the enemies of the Church to do away with both monks and nuns; but at the opening of the Chambers in November, 1880, the legislature, though strongly radical, consented not to oblige the ministers to resign only on condition that they should not go on with the execution of their decrees. This they promised, and by so doing they confessed the failure of their plans and the impossibility of destroying religious life in France. M. Emile de Girardin, though not friendly to the Church, has himself said, "that M. Ferry has declared on the religious congregations a war more unprofitable still than ridiculous, since he is obliged to allow them to subsist out of their houses, and thus what he wished to overcome and destroy is sure to triumph over his plans."

In Spain the great question for Catholics is the re-establishment of *los frailes*,—the friars,—as we perceive from the *Revista Popular* of Barcelona, and a great deal has already been done in that regard. A few years ago all the energy of government was bent on their destruction, and they are now reviving. This must suffice for that noble country.

Italian religious, in spite of the confiscation of their property and the dispersion of many houses, continue to live, and must before long break out in a stronger and healthier activity than ever. It is generally supposed that since many convents have been closed and their revenues absorbed by the state, the inmates had to fly from the country and travel to parts unknown. This is not true. They are still, nearly all of them, in Italy, and it is said by those who ought to be well informed that their efficiency is greater than formerly, and the amount of good they do is indeed wonderful. They are destined to bring back the Italian people to the practice of religion which many had abandoned, and the contributors to the *Civiltà Cattolica* do not hesitate to proclaim that there is actual progress in the religious revival. The deprivation of community life is no doubt a great evil for the religious. But this cannot last long, and the decrees and laws which have effected it will not endure on a par with religious patience and firmness of purpose.

But the most hopeful sign of the times, perhaps, results from the admirable fortitude displayed by the secular clergy wherever the

Church is attacked and oppressed. The regulars are the helpers of the seculars. These last are permanently stationed in parishes, and the parish is the first element of Church organization, as the family is of society. Nothing can stand unless the first element is solid. Hence the importance of the secular clergy. Thank God, it is solid at this moment all over Europe, which is the only part of the Church under consideration. There is no need of concealing the fact that the Catholic parish priests of Prussia, Wurtemberg, Baden, etc., were forty years ago far from edifying. That former generation of secular clergyman had been brought up in state colleges and state universities, together with candidates for the Protestant ministry, and had imbibed under infidel or at least indifferent professors the loose notions of a theology suited for both. Such was the system of education which the state had then imposed on the Church. There was, therefore, nothing surprising in the fact that the priests so educated sent petitions to Rome for the abolition of clerical celibacy. The conduct of many of them was openly scandalous, and among the whole number several at that time openly contracted civil marriage.

But since the German bishops have obtained, later on, the faculty of opening gymnasiums and seminaries for their clerics, a total change has taken place, which the recent persecution has brought out in all its mightiness. The pastors of the same churches, where the people had been formerly scandalized, are not only pious and devoted to their flocks, but carry their zeal almost to the heroism of martyrdom. Rather than obey unjust and tyrannical laws devised for the only object of destroying Catholicity in Germany, they expose themselves to all the penalties of a despotic Kulturkampf. They consent to be pounced upon by an infamous police, and subjected to the low insults of their captors. They do not shrink from the infamy of being thrown into jail with the vilest criminals, of being treated with the coarsest contumely by their judges, as if they were robbers or assassins, of being fined beyond their means, and thus made prisoners without any limit to their condemnation. This is very often the reward of their zeal, and the almost necessary termination of a wandering life through country and towns in search of their scattered flocks, of the sheep of Christ abandoned to the tender mercy of wolves who call themselves Old Catholics.

The description could be indefinitely protracted, but we must hasten on and be satisfied with this most imperfect sketch. Meanwhile all over Europe, outside of Germany and Switzerland, where the persecution rages with the same violence, the secular clergy, though less persecuted in France, Spain, Italy, and Austria, offer equally commendable traits of apostolic virtue. Among the thirty

or forty thousand secular clergymen in France a few only, deposed or suspended by their bishops for their misdeeds, cross over the eastern boundary of the country and become Old Catholics beyond the Rhine. The mass remain what they have been for a long time, pious and zealous guides of souls. Either in the ministry, or in teaching, or in writing books and articles for reviews, they form, under learned and devoted bishops, a band of well-disciplined soldiers, always on the breach against the enemy, or communicating to the most religiously-inclined among their flocks the sweetest effusion of piety and the most ardent aspirations towards heaven. Can the Church be weak when the laborers in the vineyard are so energetic?

The same symptoms are manifest in the secular clergy of Italy and Spain. A recent Catholic traveller has lately, it is true, seen in this last country a priest saying his mass with very little reverence! This has been published in a review. The fact must be true, since the gentleman said so; but we caution his readers against inferring from it that Spanish secular priests have either no faith or at least not a spark of piety. There are too many proofs of the contrary to believe it. Meanwhile the reader has to remember that in this world the good and the evil run, as it were, in the fashion of epidemics. When the turn of the bad comes it is deplorable; in the contrary case it is admirable. We will not attempt to explain this bit of philosophy, but it is so, whatever may be the cause of it. Thank God! there is at this moment an epidemic of virtue among secular clergymen all over Europe.

The result of it is an epidemic of virtue also among lay people, and this is the last ground of hope we intend to consider. It was in Paris, a short time after the revolution of 1830, that this great movement began. Ozanam, Montalembert, and their friends gave the impulsion. At that epoch no men in France appeared in the churches, at least in large cities. They all seemed to have forgotten that there was a Catholic religion in which they had been baptized in their infancy and instructed in their youth. It was suddenly a universal surprise to hear that laymen took upon themselves the mission of preaching, that is, of calling the attention of their countrymen to the beauties of Catholicism, and to the duty of vindicating the Church from threadbare calumnies. This was the first formation of the great Catholic party which has now spread all over Europe. It soon took in France a high position in the fields of literature and philosophy. It had its poets, like Victor de Laprade; its profound thinkers, like Auguste Nicholas; its scientists of the spiritualist type, like G. d'Estienne; its artists, as Flandrin; its critics, like De Pontmartin, etc. Soon it stepped on the stage of politics, and offered to an admiring world the highest

oratory in Montalembert, true statesmanship in De Falloux, a powerful influence over the legislature in Keller, Chesnelong, and Albert de Mun. We speak here only of laymen, and mention but the most prominent. The details would carry us too far if the part the clergy took in that mighty moral revolution was at all pointed out. The great names of Lacordaire, De Ravignan, Dupanloup, and a host of others would render the picture, if not complete, at least most striking. It is the combination of all those brilliant elements which extorted at last from the former adversaries of the Church, such as Thiers and Victor Cousin, the priceless liberty of education in all its degrees, which Freemasonry at this moment does its best to abrogate with the help of a corrupt legislature. But the same Catholic party is still on foot, and it remains to be seen which of the two—the cause of God or of the Devil—shall triumph in the end.

To be better convinced that right must prevail it suffices to look at the sudden extension taken by the Catholic party, as it has been called. It arose in Germany after the revolutions of 1848; it is now taking a new shape in Switzerland after a check of several years; it is at this moment rising into prominence in Italy and Spain; it begins to take a form in Great Britain and the north of Europe, in Galicia particularly; it finally is on the point of making its mark in the empire of Austria, through the Czechs of Bohemia and the numerous Austrian Catholics of note. Details unfortunately cannot be furnished here. It suffices, however, to point out the notable fact that Prince Bismarck has now to pay particular attention to the Ultramontanes in his Parliament, composed of German Catholics and the Poles. He cannot afford to despise their votes, and it is probably for this reason that he has apparently endeavored, for several years past, to come to an understanding with the Vatican, and has entered into long negotiations with several papal nuncios. Nothing so far has resulted from them, and it was probably only hypocritical on his part; but the Ultramontanes, both in the Reichstag and Landtag, are more numerous than ever, and he must at last come to terms with the Church, because he cannot continue to exasperate much longer eleven millions of Catholics who dwell in the Prussian dominions. The Germanic empire, besides, is not homogeneous, because, as was said, the *Kulturkampf* could not be enforced in Bavaria, Saxony, Würtemberg, and Baden for the reasons previously assigned. For establishing the required homogeneity the Prussian administration must necessarily have the Falk laws abolished, or at least essentially changed, in order to bring its administration in harmony with that of the other states of the empire.

In Italy it was lately said that the people will send a majority

of *clericals* to the legislature as soon as the Pope allows them to vote for deputies. The municipal government of cities is already in their hands, because the Holy Father exhorted the Catholics to participate in the elections for that object. In Spain things are not so ripe; still there is a remarkable stirring up, as some passages of reviews previously quoted evidently show.

There is, therefore, a spirit of zeal and ardor spreading at this moment through the Catholic body in all European nations. The common people, as well as their leaders, are swayed by it to a most remarkable degree. It is chiefly pre-eminent in the Prussian dominions and Switzerland. The main cause of this revival comes precisely from the persecutions to which they have been and are still subjected. The Catholics of France feel that they are not alone in their heroic struggle. They have now brethren everywhere, and even Protestants, if moderate and fair in their opinions, express openly their opposition to the tyrannical measures of Messrs. Ferry, Cazot, and others. This is prominently the case in England and this country. A cause supported by so many elements of strength cannot fail to succeed in a near future. As was remarked by us in a previous paper, the case is wholly different from that of the first French Revolution. At that epoch the lay element was altogether absent in the struggle between the Church and her adversaries. In the Church herself there were divisions produced by Gallicanism and Jansenism, which brought on the schismatical civil constitution of the clergy, and prepared the way for the almost complete victory of atheism and materialism. The clergy now, secular as well as regular, is compact and firmly united, and around bishops and priests there are the serried ranks of ardent laymen, full of faith and ready to pour out, if necessary, not only their wealth in behalf of religion, not only the copious abundance of their brilliant talent and the ever ready flow of a masterly eloquence, but, even if it came to this, their very life-blood, not, however, without striking blow for blow in the cause of God.

THE FRENCH REPUBLIC: WILL IT LAST?

THE second half of our century will ever form a most remarkable, and most interesting, most instructive period in the history of the world. And more so to the historians of succeeding ages than to our own. We who not only witness the development of event following event, but who frame to a certain extent at least these events ourselves; we, who breathe the spirit of the age, and cannot free ourselves, do what we will, from the influence this age exercises upon our individual judgment, must be ready to concede that the facts which unroll themselves before our eyes will bear a different character and present a different aspect after two or three generations to our successors. At present facts, things accomplished, naturally and quite legitimately occupy the foreground. The more these dry facts recede into the background the more will they dissociate themselves from the appendages which appear to hide from our sight the long and slow moving causes whose expression they are. *Königgrätz, Sedan, Plema*; these three names signify for us three memorable events, namely: the inauguration of German unity, the downfall of the Empire of Napoleon III., and the collapse of the Mohammedan power in Europe. But the unexpected victory of the Prussian arms over the bravery of Austrian soldiers in 1866, the no less surprising complete superiority of the German forces over the armies of "la grande nation," and the frantic efforts of a brave race to repurchase by gallant heroism a lost cause, these three momentous phases in the history of Europe will appear in a different light when the tales of victory and defeat live no longer on breathing lips. The three names will continue to serve as landmarks, so to speak, but only in so far as they are the culminating points round which so many phases of progress and civilization have clustered themselves. The broader, larger, more comprehensive view, with fewer details, but outlines clearer defined, will obtain, and the student of the philosophy of history will try to formulate the correct answer to the question, What brought these events about, what imparts tone and color and lasting importance to them, what, in fine, caused that tremendous flow of blood wherewith an inexorable fate purples the deeds of nations? And that will outlive time and be recorded in the book of life, and the rest will sink into oblivion.

In like manner, if we turn from the external to the internal history of any period, we will soon perceive that here also clearly discernible exponents meet us at every point. The double current of life which runs in the individual runs also in nations and in the human race, and we contend that the exponent of the main ele-

ment which characterizes the internal history of the second half of the nineteenth century is furnished by the problem "Church and State." All side issues group themselves quite naturally around it.

Emancipation of Church and State has like a watchword traversed within the last few decades every empire, every kingdom, every state of Middle Europe, and as yet the solution of this grave problem appears not to have been found. The results so far obtained are either an impossible compromise or a compulsory armistice. The struggle for absolute independence from the religious power on the part of the civil power has made the round of Europe and at last it has reached France, and risen there all the quicker to the surface, because in the French Republic the belligerent forces wear their own colors without disguise.

In France as elsewhere there are two parties. There is one which sees nothing but anarchy and irreligion to come from an education divorced from the control, or, at least, the supervision of the clergy; and another which sees an end of all intellectual and civil freedom if education remains under that control and supervision. The names of the political organizations representing these opposite views differ, it is true, in the various states of Middle Europe; nevertheless the fundamental articles of their respective political creeds remain identically the same. The question at issue is virtually not whether education is to continue under clerical supervision or whether it is to be made once for all and only secular, but it is, whether the posterity to which we bequeath our culture and civilization as patrimony is to include in that inheritance "faith" or not. Are they to believe like their progenitors in an omnipotent personal Deity? Is a Providence benignly presiding over each and every one's fate separately, and over all nations and the whole human race collectively, or is it not? Is an equalization of apparent injustices to be hoped for in an unknown realm with which death shall acquaint ourselves, or is all this a vast illusion! This, we repeat, is the real point of controversy, and time, that element which verifies all our actions, made men discover in our days that the real battleground on which the decisive victory must be won or the final defeat suffered, is the field of education.

In no country do the real issues present themselves in more typical form than in the present French Republic. For France has been and still continues to be an essentially Catholic country, and, as we shall presently see, the only object of the warfare of the advanced spirit of the age against religion is the Catholic Church. Honest-minded Protestants may still deceive themselves on this subject, and entertain the erroneous belief that their creeds are likewise exposed to the attack of modern "so-called" enlighten-

ment against religion. But this is not the case, and the sooner they undeceive themselves or are undeceived the better. Frederick Harrison in his paper, "Creeds Old and New," running through the October and November numbers of the *Nineteenth Century*, says quite truthfully :

"In a philosophical survey of religions, Protestantism no longer exists. It is not in the field; it is a mere historical expression. It is necessary to be a Protestant, actually to believe in the Protestant doctrines, in order to see anything valuable at all in Protestantism. It is nothing but the servile worship of a book, grotesquely strained in interpretation. It is neither a Church, nor a creed, nor a religion. It is only a Targum mechanically repeated by contending bands of Pharisees and Sadducees.

"Wherever it appears the power of the mother and of the woman, the perpetuity of marriage, generosity towards the weak, diminish. Its triumphs are towards divorce, personal lawlessness, industrial selfishness. It is a school of verbal disputation; when its Bible is gone it has nothing. The Protestant volcano has long been extinct. Notable as an upheaval some years ago, it is now dust and scorix and here and there a few fumes from its buried fire."

On the other hand, the foremost leader of the Radical party, M. Gambetta, has never concealed that behind the question of clericalism lies the question of religion in general, and that as soon as the first is settled he will raise the flag of the second. In France, therefore, the two hostile elements appear in form decidedly pronounced characters. There is arrayed on one side the most powerful Church of Christendom, the Church of Rome, and there is an enemy on the other side who honestly has thrown down the gauntlet; and with equal honesty avows that his purpose is a war of annihilation. Nowhere do Catholicity and Radicalism clash more boldly and more distinctly against each other, and France seems to be once more predestined to offer by her own fate to the world either a warning example or the prestige of leadership, as the case may be.

From these considerations result the deep curiosity and attention the present state of affairs in the French Republic attracts, and these considerations make France legitimately an object deserving of our scrutinizing observation. As lightning reveals the electrical condition of the atmosphere, so has the rigorous enforcement of the memorable March decrees revealed the true nature of the political condition into which France is being plunged. The government is drifting altogether into the hands of the Radicals; hence the ascendancy which Radicalism seems to have entered upon. And apparently the prosperous career of the party in power has been inaugurated with as much *éclat* as success.

The closing of all educational establishments in the hands of the non-authorized orders followed the closing of the schools of the Jesuits and the expulsion of the members of this order from France. To what extent this measure must affect France can only be under-

stood by those who are familiar with the great number of institutes of learning supported by the Catholic clergy. No matter how hard and earnestly the government may try to open an equal number of secular schools, the attempt promises no success, since whatever the government may choose to call into life will not be received by the vast Catholic majority of the nation as an acceptable equivalent.

The dispersion of the religious orders *en masse*, and in defiance of all legal right, is a stain upon the national honor. The harmless inmates of convents and cloisters have been driven out by the government officials in a most shameless manner. The only offence of which the monks and nuns appear guilty was this, that their lives were given up to works of charity, and that they had no armed resistance to offer to the arbitrary acts of the government, which seems to reinstate again the "might is right" of mediæval times. True the press of Europe had but one cry of condemnation for these proceedings. In France, as well as in all countries where the principle of religious and civil liberty has obtained, the dismemberment of the cloisters and the *par-force* expulsion of citizens created a deep stir, for these acts surpass by far any measures which Bismarck saw fit to resort to against the Socialists in the state of blood and iron. It is not difficult to find a *raison d'être* for the measures of the Prussian Premier; nevertheless they have been stigmatized, and that quite severely, as grossly violating the spirit of liberty evolved by our civilization. In simple justice, then, the censure to be applied to the March decrees could hardly fail to be all the more severe because of the appalling despotic character they bear on their very face; besides, the way of their enforcement is far from shedding any lustre on the administration. It was an exceedingly difficult undertaking to create for them the semblance of legality on which they apparently rest. Their sole and true basis is the fiat of a political fraction and nothing else. Even if it is admitted that one enactment which dates from the commencement of the "Reign of Terror," and another belonging to the most despotic period of the reign of the first Bonaparte furnish a precedent, a sort of artificial basis, it must not be forgotten that these two enactments have remained dead letters for no less than sixty-five years, though no less than five revolutions have passed over the country in that time. All the successive forms of government found it expedient, if not necessary, to ignore them, and the substructure on which they have been erected reduces itself to a very clever but, at the same time, very ignominious production of a maleficent ingenuity of lawyers. It is shocking and disgusting to peruse the accounts rendered by the papers in which deeds of brutality against the teachers of infancy and the protectors

of poverty, decrepitude, and old age are being committed under the eyes, nay, with the sanction and by express order, of the very power which is supposed to protect the welfare and security of the masses it governs. Nor has it been possible to impart a more than at best very ambiguous popularity to the governmental proceedings. Both parties seem to be well aware of the fact that the situation of affairs is merely a state of transition. The imperative necessity of a final adjustment of the question "Church and State," which means a final solution of the pending difficulties, is clearly recognized, and the hopes of the Radicals, as well as of the Catholics, are set on the future, and that a near future. And from the aggressive spirit manifested by the Radicals in power, and the fact that they control the wires of the whole machinery called government, furthermore from the results they have obtained so far, the inference almost suggests itself that victory will remain with the powers that be. It is well, therefore, to bear in mind that there are many victories on record which prove more disastrous in the end than open defeats, and for this reason we must forbear to forestall, from success that may be very short-lived, the future events which history still holds in the mysterious folds of the morrow.

The question we are dealing with does not concern the momentary, but the lasting, that is to say, the necessary issue. Does the French Republic in the hands of the Radicals contain a fair promise of duration or not? Does it possess life-giving and life-sustaining elements, or, if not in possession of them, does it at least generate these indispensable requisites? That is the question we are dealing with, and hence we must investigate the conditions under which Radicalism alone may hope to establish itself permanently on French soil.

The present open-handed war of destruction against Clericalism seems, it is true, to contain a propitious augury for an ultimate decision in favor of M. Gambetta's object. Moreover, the movement made by the March decrees, though its significance is only that of any preliminary step, is nevertheless the one without which hope itself would have had to abandon the cause of the Radicals. It is merely just and proper to acknowledge that the ground has been prepared with consummate skill. M. Gambetta displays true insight into human nature, and his adroit policy bears witness to a foresight into the future which we much rather would see coupled with true statesmanship. For, in order to carry out the programme of the Radical party, that is, in order to checkmate Catholicity and paralyze the power of religion, it is absolutely necessary to prevent the Catholic Church from planting the ineradicable seed of faith in the infantile mind. Youth must be prevented from listening to the voice of a priesthood which embodies in its life the command-

ments of obedience and charity which it teaches; unless that is done, faith will take root in the youthful soul, and though it may err far away from the narrow path of righteousness, it will, were it but in the last moments of life, reappear again, and by its reappearance annul all that lies between the loss and the ultimate regaining of faith. A generation growing up under the protective tutelage of the Catholic Church can never be made either to part completely with the religion instilled into the child with the mother's milk, or to hate those ministers who appear whenever misfortune, or illness, or distress appear, and who, moreover, always stretch out a helping hand, revive sunken hopes, restore the lost confidence, and thus drive away misery and wretchedness by restoring man to his full manhood. If Catholicity is permitted to gain that double stronghold on the masses, the task proposed by the Radicals is utterly hopeless. But if generations are brought up from the cradle on through all successive stages of life without a knowledge of God and knowledge of all which clusters round the personal Deity; if the first words listened to by the child impress upon the awakening intellect this, that the ideas of God and a hereafter are idle chimeras which have lost forevermore their vantage-ground, thanks to the advanced civilization of our age; if this can be accomplished, then it may be maintained that such generations will be ardent supporters of a government which incorporates and expresses their own convictions. On this line does M. Gambetta's policy move, and considering the end which is to be subserved, the move is decidedly and uncommonly correct.

But, let us ask, on what does the success of the Radicals depend? It depends primarily on this: whether they will succeed or not in engendering in the mind of the people a resolute distrust of the motives and inclinations and character of the Catholic clergy and of the Catholic Church, and, next, whether they will be able to maintain this distrust if they should not fail in generating it. Now by eliminating religion from the schools, and substituting for it the creed of enlightenment, they do not attain their end, for they simply take away what nature always tells us is invaluable and *par excellence* the gift of gifts, namely, faith; but this privation does not inspire hatred for the gift, nor does it make those into whose hands the gift has been intrusted objects of scorn and contempt. It is well known what the first fruits of the creed of despair are when this creed takes hold of the uneducated. It has been freely infused into the laboring classes in France, especially where they are massed together in large cities; it has risen to a terrible power, dreaded alike by friend or foe,—that power is Communism. But it is also well known that the degradation and horrors, physical as well as moral, of communistic laborers is beyond description. The prin-

ciples of Communism denaturalize their victims; they are the very opprobrium of our civilization and the very hotbeds of every form of wretchedness and immorality. The natural ideas of right and wrong are lost; utopian impossibilities are demanded from life and from the human society, and as long as the Radical party's promise of changing all and every relation of life will meet credulous ears, so long the discontented elements will support the Radicals. But when once the discovery is made of how absolutely powerless a government under the free and untrammelled sway of even a mind like M. Gambetta is to ratify its promises, they no longer will render homage to their leaders and lend as willing instruments, nay, tools, body and mind and soul to the erection of a building which, necessarily, must bury amongst its own ruins its most ardent builders. The utilization of this terrible force in the war *à l'outrance* against the Catholic Church forms one of the main hopes of the present *régime*, and up to a certain point it is an element the destructive force of which must not be underrated. At the same time this very force is liable to turn round at any moment against those whose game of deception must sooner or later be played out. The communistic element, therefore, does not offer in its intrinsic nature a building-stone at all.

If it aids the present *régime* for the time being in striking out boldly, it will not do so in the future. Between Gambetta and Rochefort there is but one point in common, and that is their common and uncompromising antagonism towards Rome. And if we leave the cities and manufacturing establishments and inquire into the condition of the rural districts, reports of entirely different character reach us. Whenever we desire to ascertain the real condition of the people themselves, that is to say, that portion of the nation which is most numerous, which forms the bulk of the populace, and in whose hands the real issues of France will ultimately be placed, we have to go into the country. Now this element, which not only counterbalances the former, but which outweighs everything else, has not lost the heritage of ages, that faith which made France what it is and the French nation "*la grande nation*." The Frenchman of to-day clings with the same firm tenacity to the Creator and benefactor of mankind as his ancestors did before him. If there is any change at all noticeable, the change is rather in favor of religion. An ardor is said to be displayed greater and more intense than within a comparatively recent past, as if the French Catholics of to-day meant to atone by their greater zeal and faithfulness for the prevarications of their own brethren, and thereby to appease the terrible vengeance of infinite justice, which, like a Damocles' sword, hangs threatening over the transgressors of every commandment. In the country there still lives the knowledge of an All-Father in

heaven; there still lives the spirit of reverence of and obedience to authority; there still lives the hope of better days without end, where labor will find its reward and virtue its fruition. And there also lives, and is treasured up in an unpolluted state, the true "honor" of the nation. And in all country districts we learn the March decrees have been received with a cold, in many with a quite discouraging reception. If the toiling peasant and the village blacksmith respected the authority which the Church had taught them to respect too highly to offer open resistance, they did at least deprecate measures which, while ostensibly only directed against priest and nun, were indirectly the means of depriving poverty and infancy of their time-honored protectors. Simple-minded as they are, and not familiar with the godless cant of half culture, they judge by realities, by the nourishment distributed at the cloisters and convents to the poor, by the obedience and the faithful discharge of duties they observe in their offspring as the fruit of the teaching of the Church; they judge by the comfort they derive every day interiorly when, at the tolling of morning, noon, and evening bell, they stop in field and workshop, and, uncovering their heads, pause until the peaceful sound dies away. That act of lifting the hat, unaccompanied as it may be by prayer, is, nevertheless, in all its simplicity and all its littleness, the means of drawing down upon them from heaven the dew of grace, and toiling peasant and village blacksmith effect by that simple act of prayer what proud eloquence in well-studied sentences vainly attempts to produce in crowded halls; they instil peace and contentment into their own hearts; they wipe off the brow, and a thought of their home and family rushes, perhaps, through them, and the plough ploughs deeper until evening sinks, and livelier fly the sparks from under the hammer until the day's work is over. That peasant and that blacksmith possess the conservative instinct of blissful ignorance, and are no more inclined to part with their unlearned faith than they are to give up the short moments of repose from labor they have habituated themselves to at the sound of the village church-bell. They may not be, and in all probability are not, able to give the reasons why they are unwilling to part with the faith, and the institutions called into life by that faith, but they feel by intuition that they can extend no hearty welcome to the innovations proposed and, alas, partly enacted by the government, and hence they are as loyal and true now as in olden times.

Again, it must be borne in mind that a strong feeling of patriotism dwells in every Frenchman, a feeling at once proud and just; proud because it is just and just in its pride. That feeling pervades with great force the entire nation. Now this patriotic feeling allies itself against the government in the latter's attempt to discredit the

Catholic Church and clergy. Between November, 1870, and the end of 1871, no less than sixty-two clergymen received the Legion of Honor, fifty-six the minor decorations, and two were given, under special circumstances, the military medal. These facts are, of course, well known in France, and in view of them how is it possible to impose upon the credulity of the people the charge that the clergy is devoid of patriotism? Can it be reasonably hoped that Church and clergy will ever be considered as institutions inimical to the welfare of the country? Will it be believed that a Frenchman who dons the cassock is thereby deprived of those sacred feelings for the native soil which form a cherished privilege, not of Frenchmen alone, but of every true son of every nation? Will it be believed that Catholicity tries to suppress, if not to crush out altogether, that hallowed sentiment?

It seems, therefore, quite certain that the French Government, in spite of all efforts, will neither succeed in engendering, much less in maintaining, accusations discrediting religion and its votaries in the eyes of the populace. Every false accusation fails in the course of time, and the more false the charge the less time is there needed for the perception of its true character. The differences created by the present *régime* between governing and governed are already beyond conciliation, and they must necessarily grow so violent that an overthrow of the force which rules now the country is imminent. As matters stand now, anything short of a complete change seems beyond the reach of probability.

And if we choose to inquire of experience and observation what it is that makes a being which is possessed of capacities for morality and reasoning a "brute," and what it is that makes that self-same being a "man," we will find that "faith" and faith alone furnishes the answer. The object of all education consists in making a man all that his natural gifts and his divine destiny allow him to become. Under this head, then, secular education must be condemned, since that object cannot be attained if religion is eliminated from the school. The measures, therefore, enforced by the Radical clique in regard to all educational establishments under the clergy's control, denote, not a step forward, but much rather serve as means of retarding the true progress of the nation. Religious education, it is well known, seldom fails to lead to that deep and broad conception of life which looks with comparative contempt on what is only profitable. It generally raises above the narrow confines of this world; it gives birth to unselfish patriotism, and engenders, if it does not produce, a many-sided harmonious development of the intellect. The adoption of religious education wherever it is not found, but not the discarding of the same, would suggest itself as a measure calculated to promote the true interests of a progressive civilization,

for, instead of checking the intellectual advancement of a people, it has been and will ever remain the most powerful lever for it, and it would ill befit a son of the nineteenth century to predict longevity, not to say permanency, to any government which acts in opposition to true progress. Under this head, then, also there is no reason to assume that M. Grévy's execution of the March decrees will affect France as a retrogression apt to last long enough for throwing the nation on a lower plane. On the contrary, the hope is quite legitimate that France will before long abandon a policy which brings it nearer only to a fictitious and impossible progress, and return to one befitting the achievements of the country in the past, and beneficial for the future growth of the nation in prosperity, importance, and wealth. Should the power which now regulates the affairs of the land prove too strong to yield to moral pressure and persuasion, the prediction that a radical change will be enforced if necessary seems only a proper conclusion. France may for a time submit to the machinations of an unscrupulous party machinery, but France, we can rest assured, will never bend its proud neck under the yoke of a government which prepares only a vast tomb for the whole nation.

The present *régime*, in our opinion, displays already that most dangerous symptom of dissolution, a splitting up within its own ranks. M. Clemenceau, in a speech delivered at Marseilles, emphasizes the tyrannies into which France is gradually falling in the following words :

" The doctrine of to-day teaches us that the real duty of a parliamentary leader is to find some elevated and safe position, whence he can contemplate his armies fighting in the plain below. Citizens, I have arrived at a delicate point, which I will treat with all frankness. I do not reproach M. Gambetta, since he must be named, with exercising considerable influence on the Republican party. Every one exercises in his party what influence he can by reason of his merit of services rendered. What I openly and formally complain of, and against what, in my opinion, all Republicans must protect me, is that M. Gambetta, while not, in appearance at least, grasping power, has arranged matters so that, in reality, he wields a power without a counter-weight, without control, and without responsibility, which prevents public opinion from acting on the real leader, as in all government by opinion it ought to do. . . . You ask but one thing, that he should exercise the power he holds in the light of the day and under the control of public opinion. We thus see an increase of personal power to an immeasurable degree for the benefit of a personal interest and at the expense of a public power, granted out of deference to impartiality. Is not that a real fraud ?"

Should Gambetta, in spite of all opposition, reach the goal of his ambition and enter upon the functions of the highest executive of the nation, events, we think, would precipitate themselves. The wide break between government and population would soon be widened to an extent when forbearance exhausted would cut loose from the *régime* of Radicalism. Untempered by moderation, as it then would be, it would be shaken off like a wild dream. Atheism

has never possessed the force to quicken and to uplift the world, and the attempt to engraft it upon a people, trained for centuries in the principles of true religion and habituated to bring religious truth to bear on the conduct of practical affairs, can, at best, obtain for a short episode as a fierce and blind protest against the doctrine of hope and charity, on which Christianity rests. A more futile effort to resist an established historical fact than Gambetta's leadership would inaugurate can hardly be conceived, nor could a more disastrous event befall the nation than a prolongation of the Atheistic period. For, on consulting history, it must be admitted that wherever we find Christianity pure, that is, Catholicity, there, as a rule, do we encounter orderly homes, well-trained children, sobriety, industry, thrift, and charity. Hence the promotion of stable and fruitful progress imposes upon a wise legislation the duty to cherish the Christian element, but not to extinguish it; to purify and elevate and enlarge it rather than to oppress it, silence its voice, and paralyze its energies. Radicalism, if obtaining on a large scale, would in the long run weaken the moral stamina of the community, waste its fibre, dissipate its resources, fetter its freedom, and lay, at last, the strength and honor of the nation in the dust.

What the much-vaunted enlightenment brings in its folds is well summed up in the following words: "Philosophy and science have given us priceless things, but we say they have given us no religion, no providence, no supreme centre of our thoughts and our lives. Science has practically taken away God and has found nothing else. Philosophy has reduced religion to a phrase, and has left things so. Science gives no unity to life, no rule of life, no support to the soul. Together, modern science and philosophy, stopping helplessly where they do, have chilled, paralyzed, and almost killed the spirit of devotion, of veneration, of self-abasement, of self-surrender to a great overruling power." That creed consequently would deprive France of the very virtues for which she has been so conspicuous. And these virtues resulted solely from the effects of true religion. As Fred. Harrison well puts it: "The first and the last business of religion is to inspire men and women with a desire to do their duty, to show them what their duty is, to hold out a common end which harmonizes and sanctifies their efforts towards duty, and knits them together in close bonds as they struggle onwards towards it." That office the Catholic faith has performed, and more than this, it placed the French nation foremost amongst the civilized nations of Christendom. All this, ignored by the frenzy of the Radicals, permeates the populace in a manner that no force and no pleading will ever succeed in stifling the unconscious instinct of Frenchmen to remain loyal to their faith and the traditions of their country.

It is, therefore, not an open question whether Radicalism will take root permanently in France. The past denies the possibility of it for the future. But what is to follow the overthrow of the tyrannies of the Radicals? That is the problem confronting our times. There are many persons who believe with Bossuet that an absolute monarchy is the natural form of government for a Catholic country. Others maintain with Veuillot that a liberal Catholic is a contradiction in terms, for they argue a Catholic cannot be liberal and a liberal cannot be a Catholic. Naturally, therefore, the French Republic would, according to these views, have to drift back into a kingdom as impossible as unpopular. But neither of the two views is correct.

Catholicity can, and as a matter of fact does, thrive under any and all forms of government based on principles of justice and equity, whether republican or monarchical. The only proviso for its growth and development is that the state does not encroach upon the spiritual power, and arrogate privileges to which it has no claim. Every government granting freedom of religious worship, and acting on the principle that every subject ought to "give to Cæsar what is Cæsar's and to God what belongs to God," has only a warm friend in the Church of Rome. Many children of the Catholic faith do not, we regret to say, breathe the true Catholic spirit. But Belgium as well as the American commonwealth furnish wonderful illustrations that true devotion to Catholicity and the most liberal views do not conflict at all, but can go hand in hand without any danger of collision. There is no reason, therefore, to exclude a republican form of government from the speculation as to what will supersede the *régime* Grévy-Gambetta. Theoretically any form stands open for acceptance. Nevertheless we incline to think that a constitutional monarchy would offer France the greatest promise of duration, and the surest prospect of increasing prosperity. For republicanism means essentially decentralization, and for a people so volatile, so impulsive, so apt to excess, and so gifted with genuine heroism and undying patriotism, a rallying-point seems an almost indispensable requisite. This centre only a throne furnishes, be it the purple of an empire or the *fleur-de-lys* of a kingdom; a hereditary chief alone transmits the dignity of rulership and can represent the nation as it will never cease to desire to be represented. The restoration of the kingdom of old is no less odious than the despotism of the empire, and the republic has never yet succeeded to establish itself as more than an ephemeral phase of transition. From this the conclusion lies near that a monarchy in the sense in which our age understands it would offer the best solution. But unless the political fractions which now pursue party issues collect their scattered forces we cannot

hope that they will acquire in a peaceful way the control of the affairs of state, and lead up to the form of government best suited for France. Behind these scattered forces lies the strength and the intelligence of the nation; as soon as they unite Radicalism must disappear. But if they fail to drop party politics for the sake of rescuing France from being plunged into a series of convulsions, then the world may witness the drama of beholding France facing catastrophe after catastrophe, until at last the country will emerge in a state worthy to enjoy and usufruct the immense resources which nature and Providence have with munificent liberality bestowed upon soil and inhabitants alike.

BOOK NOTICES.

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE DIOCESES OF PITTSBURG AND ALLEGHANY FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. By *Rev. A. A. Lambing*, author of "The Orphan's Friend," "Mixed Marriages," "The Sunday-school Teacher's Manual," etc. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1880. 8vo., 531 pp.

This large and handsome volume, with portraits of Rev. Charles P. McGuire, founder of St. Paul's Church, Pittsburg, and the three bishops of the diocese of Pittsburg, Right Revs. Michael O'Connor, Michael Domenec, and John Tuigg, is one of the most exhaustive contributions to the local Church history of this country that have yet appeared. It is evidently a work of great patience, care, and research. While a more flowery sketch of religion in Western Pennsylvania might have better suited the popular taste, the author has aimed to make it a work of permanent value as a book of reference. Rev. Mr. Lambing's work gives briefly an outline of the rise of the Church in Pennsylvania; then passes to the French occupation of the West, with a glance at the services of the Church at the frontier forts; and then takes up the history of Catholicity from the time the pioneers of our faith crossed the Alleghanies and reared the first modest chapel around the headwaters of the Ohio. He traces the history of the first church in Pittsburg till the establishment of the diocese, gives sketches of the bishops, and then gives in detail an account of all the other churches in the city and diocese down to the present time, completing his labor by chapters devoted to the colleges, academies, and charitable institutions, and the religious orders of both sexes that are or have been in that part of the State.

The author writes plainly and judiciously, without exaggeration or bias, and gives apparently a very accurate statement of the present position and prospects of the diocese and all its churches and institutions.

The early history of Catholicity in the province established by William

Penn is still obscure. Like the heroes before Agamemnon, there was none to record the labors of the earliest pioneers of the faith. What Watson picked up about early Catholic matters in Philadelphia has been copied by Campbell, De Courcy, and others, but proves on examination to have been unsupported by evidence. Campbell, one of the most zealous and judicious students of our history, could find nothing definite. Mr. Vallette, who more recently investigated scrupulously the history of the Philadelphia churches, met with no better success. Yet it is evident that there were priests actively exercising the ministry and winning converts to the faith before the Jesuit Father Graton came. Conjecture points to the English Franciscans, whose mission field of half a century is not yet accurately defined. When the Jesuits took charge of the mission, St. Joseph's at Philadelphia, the churches at Conewago, Goshenhoppen, and Lancaster, became the centres from which the scattered Catholics received the consolations of religion, and Conewago is in a manner the cradle of Catholicity in the west of the State.

The French Fort Duquesne, on the site of Pittsburg, had its chaplains down to the evacuation in 1758, and all appear to have been Franciscan fathers. Besides ministering to the troops, they attended also to the Catholic Indians and to the few Irish who straggled from the English colony to the French post on the Ohio. With their departure all exercise of Catholic worship ceased till the close of the Revolutionary War. Catholics were among the early pioneers as soon as arms were laid aside for the avocations of peace. As early as July, 1785, there came to the Very Rev. Dr. Carroll an application from seventy Catholics, on or near the Monongahela, who desired to have at least an annual visit from a priest. Two years later six Catholic families settled in Westmoreland County, and in the house of one of these, John Propst, Mass was said by a Franciscan, the Rev. John Causse, who had been some years in the country. His stay was short; but in 1789 the Rev. Theodore Brouwers, a priest of the same order, purchased a farm known as O'Neill's Victory, and began to erect a church at Greensburg, which he nearly completed, the first Catholic church between the Alleghanies and Vincennes. He not only became the pastor of the neighboring Catholics, but left the property at his death to the church, which still enjoys it, the sons of St. Benedict still carrying on the work begun by the disciple of St. Francis.

Meanwhile, priests were making their way to Kentucky and Illinois, certainly from 1785, and most of them stopped for a time at Pittsburg. The Carmelite Father Paul, and the worthy but eccentric Franciscan, Rev. Charles Whelan, were among these. The Rev. Mr. Flaget, afterwards Bishop of Bardstown, said Mass there in 1792, and instructed a few French whom he found there. The Rev. Messrs. Badin and Barrieres were there in the following year. In 1796 Rev. Mr. Fournier found a hundred Catholics there, who had zeal enough to raise a subscription to support a priest, but so careless were they that, though he remained there fourteen weeks, hardly six could be induced to hear Mass on Sunday. Two other priests, Rev. Messrs. Maguire and Bodkin, were also there at the time on their way to the West.

Another priest who attempted to colonize Catholics in Western Pennsylvania was the Franciscan Father Lonergan, who, as early as 1798, acquired a large tract of land and offered it to settlers. His sister, a nun, apparently of the Franciscan Order, attempted to establish a community on a farm of five hundred acres which her brother had assigned to her.

Then with the opening century Prince Galitzin began at Loreto his

plan of Catholic colonization and his long life of missionary labor and defensive works, explaining the doctrines of the Church and refuting her opponents.

In these days of Catholic colonization it is not amiss to study the Pennsylvania attempts. In no State was colonization so frequently tried, but the results bore no proportion to the means, time, and efforts employed. Conewago, Goshenhoppen, Loreto, St. Mary's, Harmon's Bottom, in spite of all that zeal could do, never became great Catholic settlements, and in our day have dwindled into comparative insignificance, exhibiting no signs of healthy growth and prosperity. No solid yeomanry, living on and by the soil and thoroughly Catholic, has come to form an appreciable part of the population.

The growth of the Church has been in cities and around manufacturing and mining works where it is of a fluctuating character, increasing when works prosper and dwindling away when they decline or stop. This nomadic character is detrimental to all ideas of home, and prevents all social and religious influence. In the plain, unexaggerated pages of Rev. Mr. Lambing, more than perhaps in any other work on the Church in this country, the thoughtful patriot can study this question, which has so vital a bearing on the future of Catholicity and morality in the United States.

The work, embracing as it does such an immense amount of detail, has some errors which can be readily corrected. The date of the dedication of the church at Harmon's Bottom, for instance, is ten years too late, and the same priest, Rev. Mr. Rafferty, began the church at Brownsville in the summer of 1825, and that at Waynesburg in September of the same year.

A writer in the *Historical Magazine*, issued by Potter, in Philadelphia, stated that the Register of Fort Duquesne was printed at the expense of the late Neville B. Craig. Rev. Mr. Lambing says that Bishop O'Connor paid for it. Neither statement is correct; it appeared as one of Mr. Shea's Cramoisy Series, and he paid for it without any aid from either the bishop or Mr. Craig, and he presented thirty copies out of the hundred that he printed to Bishop O'Connor.

The labors of that able bishop in organizing the diocese of Pittsburg, and directing it during years when every exertion was attended with intense pain, are well and faithfully described. The progress of Catholicity under his successor, the late Bishop Domenec, and the present incumbent of the see, are no less ably sketched, and the whole work is one that can be read with edification, and must be of service to all, and especially to the Catholics of the dioceses which it records so well.

YOUNG IRELAND: A Fragment of Irish History. 1840-1850. By Charles Gavan Duffy, K C.M.S. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881.

Those who imagine that they will find in this work nothing but the echoes of a more than twice-told tale lay themselves open to a very agreeable disappointment. The Young Ireland of which Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, and of which he, in conjunction with Thomas Davis, may be said to have been the father and creator, is now a very old Ireland, an Ireland that has passed away. The story of its stormy existence and final dissolution has been told time and again by one or other of the leading actors. Those who read Irish history at all know every page of this episode by heart. It seemed impossible that anything new could be said about it. Yet here comes the man of all men who might be supposed to know the story best, after most of those who were associated with him have

died, to take up the scattered threads and weave them into a work of singular interest and great value. It is a much-needed contribution to Irish history, and most men acquainted with the period will agree that the true story was never written until the appearance of the present volume.

It is obvious that Sir Charles Gavan Duffy had better opportunities than any man of viewing from behind the scenes the play that was engaging the attention of the outer world. He was the editor and founder of the *Nation* newspaper. That came into existence at a time when O'Connell, while still at the highest pinnacle of his splendid fame, was nevertheless tending, by the force of nature and the weight of years, towards decline rather than advance. He was in the wane. His great work was done. He had given Ireland life, taught it to look up and learn to walk alone. Two generations almost had come into being since O'Connell began his gigantic labors. From the second of these sprang the eager, ambitious, and wonderfully gifted group of young men that centred around Gavan Duffy and his journal. That journal was founded for a purpose, a purpose embodied in the title that Davis gave it: *The Nation*. It was to unite men of all parties, creeds, ways of thinking, in the common bond of a common nationality; the Presbyterian North and the Catholic South, the Protestant peer and the Celtic peasant, with a view to working out Ireland's liberties and winning self-government for the people. O'Connell, of course, wished the same. Nevertheless, towards the close of his career it seems undeniable that his free action as the leader of a people was hampered by his political alliance with the Whigs, while he often availed himself of Whig patronage for his relatives or followers. But whatever the difference between the aged leader's policy and the schemes of the younger party, it is certain that *The Nation* struck a true note from the start. It was a voice for which the people had been waiting. From the very first number it caught the public ear, and did a great deal to educate the public mind in Ireland, regarding not only political action, but in regard to a great number of matters in which the public mind sadly needed instruction. O'Connell could not have wished for more efficient allies, and he would have done wisely to have taken them into service. But like most leaders who have long enjoyed an unlimited power and confidence he was a little jealous of any one whom he regarded as a possible rival near the throne. He was never very friendly towards *The Nation* and its corps of brilliant young men, and at the end there was an open rupture between them that was disastrous in its consequences to both parties and to the country at large. Mr. Duffy attributes the cause of the rupture mainly to the narrow-mindedness of O'Connell's favorite son, John, who, towards the close of the great man's career, came to exercise an unfortunate influence over his mind.

Mr. Duffy seems to have preserved much of the correspondence that passed through his hands while editing *The Nation*. Few men have such opportunities of testing and discerning the drift of public opinion, of forming as well as informing public opinion, and of discovering the secret springs from which it is fed as the editor of a great newspaper. And *The Nation* in Mr. Duffy's hands, aided by his brilliant and earnest associates, at once became a great organ of Irish public opinion. It was something unprecedented in journalism at the time, and its articles were eagerly taken up, copied, or discussed in the leading English or European journals. It is only to be expected then that the present work should throw a vivid light on many matters that without it would perhaps have always remained in painful obscurity. In many respects the work might be written of to-day, and this constitutes no small portion

of its value for the general reader. Ireland has certainly advanced in many things since 1840, but with what laggard and reeling steps! its progress still clogged by the dull weight of a barbarous system of legislation devised by barbarous minds in a barbarous time. The outcries that we read in the English press of to-day against the present agitation prevailing in Ireland are simply a re-echo of the outcries of forty years ago. Now the land is profoundly agitated for a reform in a system of land tenure that the actual British Government confesses needs reforming. The constant cry in the English press is to coerce the Irish into submission, to send in the military, suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, and fill the gaols with political prisoners. The same agitation prevailed in O'Connell's day and the same remedy was proposed. Indeed, the only great Irish grievance removed since that time was the Established Church. There were even then half promises of remedial measures regarding land tenure. What has come of these within nearly half a century? Nothing at all save Mr. Gladstone's Land Act of 1870, which at the utmost amounted to little more than a sign-post set up to point the way of future legislation in this direction.

On such points as these *Young Ireland* is full of instructive light. The story of forty years ago is pretty much the story of to-day, though another "Young Ireland," a better-trained, better-read, more disciplined, and harder-headed generation has come into being. It may not be as brilliant as the past; but it could well afford a considerable loss in brilliancy for the sake of a gain in practical work and self-control. "Repeal" was only another word for "home rule," and home rule only means the natural desire, the necessity, in fact, of a free and intelligent people having some control over their own affairs, and not sending a handful of men into a foreign country to see how wonderfully their business can be neglected there. What Ireland means without home rule is nowhere shown, with more power than in the present work. It is a statesmanlike work, especially in the first book; the second being devoted more especially to the gradual widening of the breach between O'Connell and the Young Irishmen. It is clear that the author is a man thoroughly at home in his subject. That subject may to many seem a narrow one, if the struggle of a people up to liberty can ever seem a narrow subject. But over and above this, it becomes at once apparent that the writer is a man of affairs, of a wide knowledge of men as well as of books. Illustration and analogy are drawn from all quarters of the world, from all kinds of writings, from personal observation and reflection, from a close study of the details of similar struggles in other lands. It is this that lifts *Young Ireland* into a higher region of thought than was ever reached or attempted by predecessors of the author who have treated the same theme. Theirs, for the most part, were personal narratives, of greater or less interest and value. This is, so far as it goes, a history in the highest sense. It gives the rise, growth, nature, philosophy of a great national movement. It is concerned with this: with principles rather than with men, and the style is equal to the thought. It is strong and nervous, dignified yet graphic. It has the happy blending of grace and strength. Nothing could be better than the brief yet complete pictures presented of the public leaders in those stirring times. Notwithstanding the rupture with O'Connell, it would require one to go very far out of his way in order to discover injustice or lack of generosity towards the man to whom, of all men save one, Ireland has thus far in her history owed most. It is plain, on the contrary, that the author is full of admiration, though not blind admiration, of the Irish leader. The work opens with the dawn of the repeal movement and ends with

the death of Davis. Davis is evidently the author's type of a modern Bayard, and the affection with which he writes of him breathes a woman's touching tenderness. By ending there he avoids the hideous famine scenes and the complete breaking up of O'Connell. It is surely time for English statesmen to consider whether it is wise to persevere in a policy that drives men like Gavan Duffy into rebellion.

CEREMONIAL INSTITUTIONS: Being Part IV of the Principles of Sociology. By Herbert Spencer. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

It is three years since Mr. Spencer gave to the public his first volumes of the *Principles of Sociology*; and, in the meantime, he has prepared and now presents to us the first of his second volume on the same object. The book is a small octavo volume of some two hundred and twenty-five pages. Its object is to show the natural development of ceremonial institutions, and how civil and religious restraints are evolved from the restraints put upon us by ceremonial observances. In the first chapter the author treats of ceremony in general. He first establishes briefly, but apparently to his own satisfaction, the assertion that ceremonial government is the earliest and the most general kind of government—the embryo, if we may so speak, from which by a process of super-organic evolution all political and religious government has sprung, or, to use his own words: “The modified forms of action caused in men by the presence of their fellows, constitute that comparatively vague control out of which other more definite controls are evolved—the primitive, undifferentiated kind of government from which the political and religious governments are differentiated, and in which they ever continue to be immersed.” From this conclusion several corollaries are deduced and exemplified, among which we shall mention the following: That the control of conduct which arises from ceremonial government has precedence over civil and religious controls; that these ceremonial restraints begin with sub-human types of creatures, etc.

Now, we do not deny that in society there may be a certain kind of evolution. For example, we hold that civil society has been evolved from parental society; that, in course of time, as families became large the authority which the father exercised as head of the family was changed into the authority of one ruling a community. In like manner, that the laws, customs, and manners of the family took extensions as the wants and necessities of the increasing community were developed. But that religious society was evolved from some ceremonial observance of the primitive man we consider to be wholly untenable; nor does Mr. Spencer anywhere give proofs which would induce even one who has studied only a schoolgirl's textbook on logic to assent to such a proposition. Nor, indeed, need this appear surprising, if we consider that Mr. Spencer, consistently with himself, is now but putting into practice that system of reasoning and inference which he explains in his *Principles of Psychology*, wherein the whole process of reason is misunderstood, falsely defined, and hopelessly confounded with instinct. We are prepared, then, to find in the pages of this first chapter reasoning substantially as follows: “In the rule of St. Benedict, nine chapters concern the moral and general duties of the brothers, while thirteen concern the religious ordinances.” Therefore, “a relatively large amount of ceremony and a relatively small amount of morality” prevailed in mediæval Europe. It seems to us that in imitation of the preceding we could reason in this manner: From the Old Testament we know that God gave only ten commandments to Jews, but that he gave whole chapters in the book of Exodus which concern

ceremonial ordinances. Therefore, God seems to have desired from the Jews a larger amount of ceremony than morality!

In the following eleven chapters Mr. Spencer traces the natural genesis of the various kinds of ceremonial observances. In the chapter headed "Trophies" he shows the meaning of trophy-taking, its social effects, its various forms, and their development. Finally, an indirect connection is discovered between trophy-taking and ceremonial government; it is found to enter "as a factor into the three forms of control, social, political, and religious." Facts are then related, by which he intends to show that trophies have been offered as a means of propitiating "a god developed from an ancestral ghost." In the next chapter, on "Mutilations," the surrendering a part of the body to rulers, the depositing it in temples, or the offering it at tombs, is shown to be a sequence of trophy-taking. The different kinds of mutilations are then noticed, and their relations with social and religious control. Here, after adducing many examples, he informs us that "these proofs sufficiently dispose of the current theological interpretation" of circumcision. Mr. Spencer gives us no sign that he knows the current theological interpretation of which he so summarily disposes; for he gives innumerable facts to prove that this custom obtains among various nations of different degrees of civilization. But do any of the facts prove that this ceremony was practiced prior to the time of Abraham, or even that it was prevalent at that time among other nations than the Jews? How then can it be asserted that the current theological interpretation is disposed of? What is to prevent me from believing that this was a divine institution, a covenant between God and the Jews to distinguish them as the chosen people; that it passed to other nations either during the different captivities of the Jews or even sooner by social intercourse; and that finally among these nations its original meaning was lost? In the following chapters on "Presents," "Visits," "Obeisances," "Forms of Address," "Titles," "Badges and Costumes," "Further Class Distinctions," and "Fashion," the same general order is followed. The alliance of these ceremonials and the evolution of one from the other are traced, their different forms are discussed, with numerous examples, and finally it is shown how they severally enter into political, social, and religious control. Among the truths Mr. Spencer endeavors to impress on his readers, is that our idea of God is a development of the idea of "an ancestral ghost." It is scarcely necessary to say that this conclusion is arrived at by false and incomplete induction. We could cite various portions of this book where this theory is propounded and illustrated with facts, but that the respect we have for our readers' intelligence and patience forbids it.

The faults of the book are not new, nor are they proper to this volume. Every one acquainted with Mr. Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy* is aware that he holds man to be the product of evolution:

"The abandoned orphan of blind chance,
Dropped by the wild atoms in disordered dance;
Or from an endless chain of causes wrought,
And from unthinking substance born with thought."

As a consequence the primitive man of ages ago does not differ in his social or religious characteristic from the savage of to-day. Hence, the customs and manners of savages are arranged according to the different grades of their social degradation, and from these facts inferences are drawn which might be granted, were it true, that primitive man was a savage who by his own unaided efforts gradually civilized himself; that

the present is an element from which we can infallibly deduce the past. This recalls a story told by St. Thomas of a boy who was born on a solitary island and left by his mother, and, after he had grown up, would not believe that man begins by being conceived, is carried in the womb, and is born of a mother. "For it is impossible," said this incredulous boy, "that I should live for nine months without breathing, eating, or satisfying the other necessities of life." That boy infers the past from the present. So our author, looking at facts as they are now, cannot understand how primitive man could be anything else than a savage of the lowest type that exists to-day. So, likewise, the beginning of man as a social or religious being is held to be impossible if explained by any reasoning which rests on anything but the present. Together with these and other faults of theory, there is at times a vagueness of terminology and expression which, to say the least, does not help to make a weak argument stronger or to render a dark point clearer. In general, we should say that the present volume is a collection of facts mingled and interlarded with many fancies, with here and there a series of sentences which, at first sight, bear all the outward marks of being an argument; but, if examined closely, it will be seen that nothing is proved; that inferences are faulty; that facts are so beautifully adjusted to some preconceived theory as to strike the imagination, but the mind is left void of conviction.

COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM IN THEIR HISTORY AND THEORY. By *Theodore D. Woolsey*. New York: Scribner & Co. 1880.

The topics which have given the name to the book before us, and kindred subjects, have called forth within the recent past a literature of their own. We do not pretend to be familiar with every work that has been placed on the book market, but a number of productions which have fallen under our observation may be properly called extravagances of human thought. Many seemingly quite learned treatises have been written by men supposed to be well informed, which possess the very questionable merit only, that a reader is willing to attach to individual opinion. And for this reason very erroneous opinions in regard to the nature and intrinsic character, growth, and development of the problems which confront our days in socialistic and communistic movements, have obtained current value. The appearance of Mr. Woolsey's book is therefore doubly welcome. It contains a succinct but very exact historical sketch of the two "isms" he is principally dealing with, and furnishes the reader with sufficient data regarding their doctrines for the formation of an independent estimate of their value. From beginning to end we discern with undisguised pleasure the careful research into and the exhaustive absorption of all the material which tends to throw light on either of them.

We do not entirely agree with Mr. Woolsey. For instance, we would have preferred to see him draw a line between communistic forms of life and community life. For, however much this line of demarcation may be ignored, it does exist, and hence we can only regret its omission. Religious communities do not spring from communistic principles; the latter, as the author takes pains to explain, verge in most cases directly, in others indirectly, but without fail in either case, into Atheism, and hence they assume invariably hostile attitudes towards religion in general. The motive power which puts prince and beggar into sandals and haircloth and cassock differs in kind from the motive power which draws laborers together to meet in council and decide upon an organized strike against their

employers. This being granted, it seems rather strained to see the primitive forms of monastic life put into the same category as those social excrescences which we find enumerated in Chapter II. Much less do they serve as prototypes for associations whose ultimate object is the disestablishment of religion, since Christian convent life bears the imprint of religion on its very face. The religious communities as they exist now, and have existed in the Church of Rome for centuries, form, we take it, one of the strongest cohesive elements of society; whereas, all that savors of socialism or communism serves only to disintegrate society.

However, where there is much that is excellent, a deficiency in one point deserves a lenient treatment at the critic's hand; and the sketch contained in Chapters III., IV., V., and VI., of the gradual development of socialism in Germany and of communism in France, is in point of accuracy, brevity, and fulness unquestionably the best that has come to our notice. St. Simon and Fourier, and again La Salle, Marx, and Schaeffle, are put before us with great precision and much instructive force. Chapters VII. and VIII. discuss the dissolving influence of any such system—should ever a day come when one or the other would obtain a short-lived sway. This influence is made to loom up before our mental vision in its naked truth, and with great power of conviction; and it is earnestly to be hoped that this valuable book may effect many and radical cures among those who give their adherence to these systems simply because they lack a thorough information as to what these systems really are. In the very short preface the author alludes to the dissatisfaction existing more or less at all times with the forms of society that be, without giving the reason for this at first sight rather strange phenomenon. It is to be found, and to be found only, in the fall of man. That, and that alone, explains the never-ending revolt against order and authority which runs through almost every page of history. And the cause, as it were, points, in this case at least, also clearly to the one remedy that alone can remove it, namely, "true Christianity." This, it is gratifying to observe, the author recognizes very clearly as the one force that can vanquish and never will be vanquished itself. And in this view we fully coincide with Mr. Woolsey. Only the form of Christianity which in Mr. Woolsey's eyes may act as preserver and regenerator of society does not offer any guarantee as far as experience teaches us. He tells us himself how religion has lost its stronghold on the nations since the sixteenth century. This we do not deny; but we wish the statement qualified, and we venture to suggest also an explanation.

Religion, separated from Rome, did grow weaker and weaker, because it grew more and more into a mere matter of our intellect. If this were true, namely, that religion, as it has come to be believed to be, is a mere and pure matter of reason, then I for one fail to see what arguments can be raised against such argumentation as William De Le Sueur puts forth in regard to the change of the basis of morality. Reason, no doubt, is an element which in matters of faith must be just as well consulted as it is in all matters of our life and conduct; matters that clamor every day, nay, every hour, for our decision. True faith, as I understand it, is not producible by cool and calm ratiocination. The "quick-eyed sanctity" of which Dr. Newman speaks is as little likely to emanate from an intelligent use of our mental faculties alone, as, on the other hand, the consciousness that morality, as far as it is simply natural morality, does not withdraw itself from the realm of evolution, is likely ever to inspire individuals to heroic noble deeds of self-sacrifice. The "heart," it seems to us, is a factor too much overlooked in the transaction, especially by non-Catholics. The heart may be called the seat of grace *par*

excellence, and on grace religion must depend if it is to be the regulating power of human will, human action, in fine, human life. In the Catholic Church the sacraments are continuous channels of grace, through which the individual may at any time obtain the necessary influx directly from heaven. Outside of Rome these means of grace are hardly recognized at all. The faint semblance which some conservative denominations have succeeded in preserving can surely not be expected to produce the effects which alone, in Mr. Woolsey's estimate, and in our own and in that of the Church of Rome also, are able to counteract the evil wrought by the spread of the irreligious, if not downright atheistic tendencies of all "isms." The absence of this ever-flowing, vivifying current of grace in all Protestant churches has, since the Reformation, alienated nation after nation from Christianity not only, but from religion altogether; and it seems to us that it would be, therefore, quite in vain to look for regenerative strength in religious systems whose record of the past shows a steady increase of weakness. Rome's triumph in the future rests on the same foundation as her victories in the past. And to that Church apply truly Mr. Woolsey's words: "That it can revive a nation at its lowest ebb of prosperity, that it can never die, and that it possesses the power to propagate itself through all the races of mankind." Mr. Woolsey's position is, therefore, quite correct, though it applies only to the Catholic Church. Time and space do not permit us to go into details, but we earnestly hope that a book so instructive and so full of interest in its bearing upon burning questions of the day may do the good it is meant to produce. The erudite author has materially contributed towards enlightening the world on the topics he treats, and clarifying erroneous opinions, and to such productions Catholicity extends a most hearty welcome.

SYNOPSIS OF AN ARTICLE ON THE ZODIACAL LIGHT. By *Fr. M. Dechevrens, S. J.*
Published in the "Etudes," April, 1880.

Whilst the religious orders are suffering persecution in France, because they are supposed to be hostile to progress and science, three Jesuit missionaries in China publish three memoirs that are a fitting rebuke to their calumniators, as they are the best contradiction of the false accusations advanced. One was written by Father Marc Dechevrens, S. J., Director of the Observatory at Zi-ka-wei, near Shanghai, China. It is the first instalment of a work embracing the record of his observations on the zodiacal light during many years, with deductions from these observations, being the groundwork of a theory in explanation of the phenomenon. Another, by Father Hende, is devoted to the description of the species of soft-shell turtles found in his missionary district, and the third, by Father Rathins, contains a detailed account of the cochineal insect of China.

The published portion of Fr. Dechevrens's memoir is divided into three parts: in the first he reviews the principal observations made on the zodiacal light up to the present day; in the second he describes the phenomenon as he observed it; and, finally, in the third part, he advances his theory by which he hopes to be able to account for all the difficulties of the problem.

All the theories concerning the zodiacal light that have been proposed up to the present time may be reduced to two classes, namely, those that locate the phenomenon within the earth's atmosphere, and those that locate it in the atmosphere of the sun. In each of these classes there are two theories: in the former are those of Professor Balfour-Stewart

and Felix Marco ; in the latter those of Laplace and Heis, to which are now to be added those of Father Dechevrens. Professor Balfour-Stewart's theory, published in 1870, supposes that if the aurora borealis may be considered as secondary currents consequent upon feeble but rapid changes in the earth's magnetism, so also the zodiacal light may be looked upon as a terrestrial phenomenon, to be accounted for in a similar manner. This he holds for the reason that secondary currents are produced, not only in a rigid conductor in presence of an electro-magnet of variable force, but also in an elastic conductor that passes along the lines of force of a constant magnet. These latter conditions are fulfilled by the earth and its atmosphere ; for when the trade-winds ascend to higher regions of the atmosphere they become conductors, on account of their great rarefaction, and as they pass rapidly over the earth's lines of magnetic force it may easily be admitted that they become charged with their electric currents, and that they even become luminous, as do highly rarefied gases when they are conductors of electricity. This luminosity constitutes the zodiacal light according to the theory of Professor Stewart.

In order to explain the phenomenon of terrestrial magnetism Ampère supposed the existence of electric currents circulating around our earth, from east to west, and in direction perpendicular to the magnetic meridian of any given place. These currents taken together are equivalent to a single resultant current passing from east to west, coinciding in direction with the magnetic equator, and they were supposed to be caused by the variations of temperature at the earth's surface consequent upon the variation in the amount of heat received from the sun. This theory was advanced in 1876 by M. Felix Marco as a sufficient explanation of the zodiacal light.

Fr. Dechevrens shows that these theories are in direct opposition to the facts as observed by him. According to Professor Stewart's theory the luminous appearances would coincide with the direction of the upper trade-winds ; and according to M. Felix Marco, they should appear along the parallels or the equators, and could not remain visible at any one point for more than two hours at a time.

The zodiacal light consists of a mass of luminous matter, extending on opposite sides of the sun, in two branches, shaped like a lance-head, having approximatively the same axis of direction, or, in other words, making with each other an angle of 180° . The trade-winds, as is well known, make with each other an angle of only 90° ; therefore the theory of Professor Stewart fails in so far to agree with the facts observed. The theory of M. Marco is in no less opposition to the facts than that of Professor Stewart, for in the first place the direction of the branches of the zodiacal light never coincides with that of the parallels or the equators ; and in the second place the phenomenon is often visible for seven or eight hours at a time, and has sometimes been seen even at midnight.

The fundamental error of these theories has been the supposition that the phenomenon is atmospheric. Since the time of Laplace, Fr. Dechevrens is the only scientist that held the opinion that the phenomenon of the zodiacal light was to be referred to the solar atmosphere. The explanation is easy. The observers were few ; and the observations were neither sufficiently regular nor sufficiently detailed to admit of exact or satisfactory results. But the results obtained leave no room for doubt about the question. To different observers, separated by great distances from each other, the phenomenon was, at the same moment of time, always projected on the same regions of space ; a circumstance that could not occur if the light were confined to our atmosphere.

Heis, of Münster, who, during the twenty-eight years from 1847 to 1875, made two hundred and eighty-seven observations, published in 1856 the result of his labors in the following words: "The zodiacal light could be considered as due to a nebulous ring surrounding the earth. But does this nebulous ring really exist? Is it within or without the moon's orbit? These are problems that can only be solved by simultaneous observations made at different places in both hemispheres."

This theory is an advance on all previous work, but is yet unable to account for many features that are readily explained by Fr. Dechevrens. His theory is briefly as follows:

The analytical study of the zodiacal light has proven that it is polarized; and we may safely conclude that this polarization is due to the reflection of the sun's rays by solid particles of matter. What these particles of matter may be we can easily explain if we once adopt the nebular hypothesis of Laplace, in which he supposes that there still exists around the sun a portion of the primitive nebula from which by successive cooling and condensation our present solar system was evolved. The elements of this nebula not being intimately united with the solar atmosphere continue to rotate with velocities dependent on the distance from the sun's centre. This nebula, although it does not completely fill the earth's orbit, yet extends far beyond the ecliptic. It is of irregular form, oval rather than elliptic. Its greater dimension crosses the ecliptic at two points, whose longitude are 220° on the one side and 100° on the other, so that the earth in its revolution around the sun encounters this axis in April and December. Hence it follows that the sun is not the central point of the nebula. When the earth passes from aphelion to perihelion it is wholly without the nebula; at other times it moves along its border or in the interior. Its density is not uniform, and this gives rise to the opinion that the particles of matter are not uniformly distributed in the mass.

This simple, though yet incomplete, theory has the advantage of accounting for all the difficulties of the phenomenon; it is borne out by the observations of other workers in the same fields, such as Heis, Eylert, and the American astronomer Wright. It is the result of many years' study, and is based upon two hundred and fifty observations made in four years, from 1875 to 1879, at Zi-ka-wei, in China, where the Jesuits have established an observatory, and placed Fr. Dechevrens in charge.

A HISTORY OF THE DEVOTION TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE FIRST TEN CENTURIES. By *Cardinal Hergenroether*. Translated from the German, with an Introduction, by *Rev. D. S. Phelan*. St. Louis: P. Fox, 1880, pp. 67.

This most opportune little book has for its author the illustrious German divine, so well known in Europe for his *Anti Janus, History of Photius*, and other works of a controversial or historical character, and who was most deservedly, together with the great Newman, raised to the dignity of cardinal by our present Holy Father, Leo XIII. It is a book meant not only for those who are outside of the Church, but also for some Catholics who are inside of her communion, but do not share her spirit, for they know not what it is, as our Lord said in rebuke to His Apostles (Luc. ix. 55). They have the presumption (for by what milder name can it be called?) to look down with pity on the devout crowd that honors the Virgin Mother of God, without stopping a moment to inquire, or caring in the least whether, in its expressions or practices of devotion, it offend heretical prejudice or the pretended intellectual refinement of our century. They think and call themselves "enlightened," but they are sadly mistaken. The "light" that is in

them is very darkness and not light, for it is born of ignorance. They imagine that devotion to the Blessed Virgin, especially in its popular forms, is the growth of the Dark Ages, and that, though within certain narrow limits not condemned by Catholic dogma, it is on the whole a practice better suited to the untutored and those of low degree than to those who possess education and culture. This little work will teach them that the Spirit of the Church in this respect was the same in her early days as in the Middle Ages; and that the illustrious Fathers of the Eastern and Western Churches were as warm and enthusiastic in their devotion to the great Mother of God as any mediæval theologian.

For those who have been taught by modern heresy that her praise interferes with the praises of God, the learned author shows how her title to our praise is founded in God's Holy Word. Besides the general claim to our honor that she possesses in common with all those whom the Great King "hath a mind to honor," because they are His chosen servants and His friends, we have her own prophecy, inspired by the Holy Ghost, that all generations SHALL call her Blessed (Luc. i. 48). Since, then, all must bless her,—that is, acknowledge and praise her high dignity,—the prophecy involves an implicit command for all children of the New Covenant to bless and praise this spotless handmaid of the Most High, who, of all others, found favor in His sight when a mother was to be chosen of whom He might take our flesh, and in it redeem mankind. Moreover, since God's Word cannot be made void, the prophecy must be fulfilled to its full extent, and all those unhappy children of error who now refuse to bless and praise her must do it hereafter, when heresy and all its illusions shall have passed away forever, on the great judgment-day, or in the eternity that lies beyond it. To bless and glorify this Virgin Mother is a mark of true Christianity according to the ancient doctrine of the Church in the East and in the West. In the Syrian liturgy Mary is often styled "the glory of the world." But in one passage this is said with a significant addition: "Thou art the glory of the world, for all who magnify thee. Thou art the boast and glory of all true Christians!" This evidently shuts out of the true Church all those who have learned from Luther and Calvin, Cranmer and Knox, to despise her prophecy and refuse to aid in its accomplishment. For they alone are "true Christians" who magnify and bless her holy name.

The Cardinal's little treatise has been sufficiently well translated, and ought to be circulated everywhere. Its small size, no less than its intrinsic merit, is in its favor. It will furnish most instructive reading for both Catholics and Protestants. If it were put in the shape of a tract it would do a great deal of good. We therefore venture to suggest a few things that may be corrected or improved, without the least intention of detracting from the excellence of the work or its translation. In the first place, we wish the translator had added the epithet of "saint" to those holy men and Fathers of the Church to whom it rightfully belongs. It is quite natural that heresy having no saints of its own should begrudge our saints the title. But the Catholic and Christian ear is always pained in hearing our Apostles, Martyrs, and Holy Doctors stripped of their due appellation, and called simply by their name, as if they were no better than a Tully or a Cato, a Trajan or a Domitian. Perhaps English-speaking Catholics are more sensitive on this score, because heresy amongst us is generally more disrespectful, more contemptuous towards our saints, than in other countries. To give one example, out of many in the book, we have (p. 10) the rather rough expression, "Bishop Zeno," instead of "St. Zeno, Bishop of Verona." The phrase in the original, perhaps,

sounds less uncouthly. In striking contrast with this, the title of saint is found elsewhere (p. 26) incorrectly given to Theodoret. This cannot possibly be an error of the illustrious author, whose extensive learning is too well known from his other works to allow such a supposition. In many of these he often quotes Theodoret, but never with the title of saint. It must be an inadvertence of the translator, or possibly of the printer, who has not done his work very carefully. Thus we find Royon (p. 45) for Noyon; Cyprus (p. 26) for Cyrus; and, not to mention several other errors, Cheer (p. 43) for Chur (Coire), the old Curia Rhaetorum. There are quotations on pp. 15 and 23 that need revision. On p. 48 we have *Evangeleries*, which, even if written as it should be, *Evangeliaries*, is too awkward a word for our language, and has never been introduced into English. Its Latin original, *Evangeliarium*, though used by German scholars, seems to be avoided by scholars of good taste. Bianchini prefers *Codex Evangeliorum*; Dr. Ubaldi, *Evangelistarium*. This is the correct term, and has been adopted in our language.

CLAIMS OF A PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL BISHOP TO APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION AND VALID ORDERS DISPROVED. With various misstatements of Catholic Faith, and numerous charges against the Church and Holy See, corrected and refuted. By S. V. Ryan, Bishop of Buffalo. In two parts. Buffalo: Catholic Publication Company, 1880.

Bishop Cox, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, against whom this masterly work was written, does not appear to much advantage as a controversial divine when compared with his deceased Presbyterian father. The latter had his strong religious and politico-religious crotchets, some of them very offensive to the sober-minded portion of the American public; but for him we must charitably suppose they were leading principles, and he stuck to them with a consistency for which even enemies might praise him. His Episcopal son, on the contrary, has no principles whatever, or rather two grand contradictory principles which he uses in turn, as occasion may require. In other words, he tries to be both Catholic and Protestant. With his fellow-Protestants, including even the majority of those of his own Episcopal communion, for whom he cannot disguise his contempt, he takes high Catholic ground, or rather puts on ultra-Catholic airs. To believe him, he is no Protestant, but a "Catholic" bishop of the "Anglo-American branch," whatever that means theologically or historically; for no rational explanation of such terms has ever been or can ever be given. Ecclesiastically, the Catholic Anglo-American branch is not only a nonentity but an illegal figment, seeing that the name of "Catholic" was solemnly abjured by the American Episcopal Church in council assembled some thirty-six years ago, when an effort was made by Dr. Jarvis and a few other enthusiasts of his stamp to coax her into the assumption of this hateful name. The habitual attempts of Dr. Cox to fasten upon her a name that she has rejected with scornful solemnity can scarcely be regarded as fair and honest; or else they argue on his part a deepseated conviction that, instead of being taught by his Church, he has received a commission to be her teacher, since he understands her doctrine and constitution better than she does herself. For him, as a "Catholic" bishop, all American Protestants are mere dissenters and separatists, the bulk of his own church-people stupid Erastians and heretics at heart, though outwardly united to what, deny and despise it as they will, he will persist in calling their "Catholic" communion. He is highly indignant that a handful of scholars, Anglican, Presbyterian, Liberal Christian, and the like, have lately banded together for the purpose of reforming the Protestant English Bible, without first obtaining the leave and goodwill of himself and his invisible fraction

of the American Catholic Episcopalian Church. And this feeling of indignation he expresses through the newspapers, to the great amusement of the Protestant public.

Such is the "Catholicity" of Bishop Cox when dealing with his Protestant brethren, with those of his own household. But when he comes face to face with real Catholicity, when he has to take up arms and assume the defence of his petty sect against the true Catholic Church, then he all of a sudden, as if by magic, changes his principles and he appears in his true light. He is an ultra Protestant, and there is among the whole band no foul-mouthed Thersites,

Loquacious, loud, and turbulent of tongue,

who can excel him in evil speech and wanton vituperation. Confronted with the true Church, he flings candor, honesty, and truth to the winds, and willingly takes his place in the foremost ranks of those dissenters whom at other times he affects to despise. All his assumed airs of Catholicity are thrown aside, and he sinks to the level of the Maria Monks and Gavazzis in the service of their common cause.

Such is the Janus Bifrons, the adversary of double face and shifting principles, whom Bishop Ryan has had to encounter. And he has dealt with him most effectually, scattering into the air all his idle claims and pretensions, and triumphantly repelling all his assaults upon the Catholic Church and her visible Head. The good Bishop has done this not only with a vigorous logic that must convince every reader, but with a meekness that is edifying and truly wonderful, considering the character of his opponent, whose reckless slanders and persistent disingenuousness would sorely try the temper even of a saint.

The right reverend author has, however, done something far more important than merely stripping Dr. Cox of his borrowed Catholicic plumage. He has laid before his readers, in an easy and popular, yet clear and forcible way, the whole intricate question of Anglican ordinations. He has proved conclusively that in the Anglican Church there is no shadow of Apostolical succession, no valid priestly orders. Besides, many of the current calumnies against our holy religion are examined and satisfactorily refuted. The work, we are confident, will not only be relished by all candid readers, but will accomplish a great deal of good, and will be classed hereafter among our standard books of controversy.

THE CHURCH AND THE MORAL WORLD; CONSIDERATIONS ON THE HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH. By the *Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S. J.*, New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1881.

This work, though a distinct and independent treatise, is in some respects a sequel and supplement to a previous work of the learned author, *The Church and the Gentile World*. In the last-named work he showed, by extensive and careful historical investigation, how the Church at its very outset quickly spread throughout the world, and thus at once acquired the characteristic or mark of universality. In the work before us he treats of the sanctity of the Church, and proves that the title and attribute of holiness is justly ascribed to her; that it is by her power and through her influence that the world is to some extent delivered from the moral corruption that prevailed everywhere before the advent of our Saviour; and that virtues which were almost unknown in ancient times are now generally admired, recognized as praiseworthy, and to a large extent practiced; that in the Church only are true virtue and morality cultivated and actualized in their fullest extent, reaching their highest

and purest form and becoming sanctity, and that whatever of real "enlightenment" the world now possesses, in contradistinction to the moral darkness of the ancient heathen world, it owes to the constant, though unappreciated and unacknowledged, action upon it of the *Holy Catholic Church*.

The conclusion from this is irresistible that the Church is of divine origin and nature. For, as God is both *optimus* as well as *maximus*, His Church must possess a like character; and its sanctity indeed is but the effect of the infinite love of Christ for His Church, who "delivered himself up for it that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the Word of life, that he might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

In the development of his argument Father Thebaud divides his work into two books or sections. In the first he places before the reader the *principles* or *sources* of the sanctity which the Church possesses. In the second he brings forward a large array of historical facts, proving that the Church is and always has been *holy*. Both parts of the work are interesting, and both, too, have a very important relation to the prevailing skepticism of the age. There are those who, on purely historical grounds, reject with deserved contempt the vulgar Protestant perversions of the history of the Church, and acknowledge the general fact that the Church in all past ages was a powerful agent in purifying and elevating society, but endeavor to account for what she was and did on natural principles. This error is admirably met and refuted in the first part of Father Thebaud's work. On the other hand, there is a less intelligent and studious and very large class of persons, who have formed their notions of the Church from the traditional Protestant misconceptions and misrepresentations of its history and character. To them the *facts* which the learned author has with great industry and research gathered and digested will be of immense service. In its general scope the work is a complete refutation of the fallacy which Mr. Lecky, in his for-a-time popular work on the history of European morals, formulated, that the superiority of modern principles of morality over those of the ancient Pagan nations is due simply to the natural progress of public opinion. The value of Father Thebaud's work, however, is not entirely nor, indeed, mainly controversial. It will assist intelligent and thoughtful Catholics in tracing out the *principles* of the perpetual and glorious sanctity which they behold and admire in the Church; and it also places before them, in clear and compact form, facts connected with the practical working of those principles both in the Church and upon the world, which will both increase their acquaintance with Catholic history and their admiration and reverence for the Church which Christ has made and ever preserves *holy* as well as universal.

THE SPOKEN WORD; or the Art of Extemporary Preaching, its Utility, its Danger, and its True Idea, with an easy and practical Method for its attainment. By *Rev. Thomas J. Potter*. New and cheaper edition. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880. 12mo.

This is a reprint of a book first published by the author some eight or nine years ago. Young priests will find it a very useful help in their transition state between preaching from manuscript and memory and extempore preaching. The latter does not mean, as is too often thought, preaching without preparation. It is a gift that does not come from nature, but is the result of a natural aptitude, which needs long and

careful cultivation before one is qualified to speak without writing and memorizing. To show by what means this aptitude may be successfully cultivated is the author's purpose, and he has done it judiciously and with a pleasing style.

THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK OF BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE. With selections from the most distinguished Authors. By the *Rev. O. L. Jenkins, A.M.* Edited by a Member of the Society of St. Sulpice. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1880. 8vo., 517 pages.

The present work was commended in the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY of April, 1876. This second edition has been improved by many suitable additions, and no less by judicious omissions. Several deserving Catholic writers have been added, and even the list of our profane writers has been increased by looking over the whole country and giving credit to literary merit outside of New England. We can have no better manual for use in our colleges and academies.

THE ORIENTAL AND BIBLICAL JOURNAL. Edited by *Rev. Stephen D. Peet*, Clinton, Wisconsin. Chicago: Jameson & Morse. Vol. i, Nos. i-iv.

As far as we have read the numbers of this new quarterly, its editors and contributors seem determined not only to promote science, but to turn it to its noblest end, the defence of revealed truth. We can only, therefore, cordially welcome it to a place among the periodical literature of the day, and wish it a long and prosperous life.

MANUAL FOR COMMUNION. Containing Meditations and Prayers in the form of a Retreat before First Communion, adapted to the Use of Persons of all Classes. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1880.

This little work, which is published with the imprimatur of the Most Rev. Archbishop of Dublin, is primarily intended to assist children in preparing for their first communion, and is well adapted in style and matter for that purpose. Its usefulness, however, extends beyond its special purpose, and older persons of all classes will find it a very profitable manual for guiding and aiding them in meditation. Copious use has been made in its compilation, of the writings of St. Alphonsus, Luigi, Bossuet, Fenelon, Frooson, A' Kempis, Arnold, and other approved writers.

THE DOMINICAN HYMN BOOK. WITH VESPERS AND COMPLINE. London: Burns & Oates, 1881.

In addition to the services for Vespers and Compline from the Dominican Breviary, this volume contains a large number of very beautiful hymns and motetts, with English translations, and a number of hymns originally composed in English. Taken as a whole the collection is an excellent one.

THE MISSION OF WOMAN. The Substance of a Discourse by *Monseigneur Mermillod*, Bishop of Hebron, addressed to the children of Mary, in the Convent Chapel of the Sacred Heart at Brussels, May 18, 1867. Translated from the French, by M. A. MacDaniel. London: Burns & Oates, 1881.

This address is a lucid and able exposition of the subject indicated by its title. It shows the high and holy nature of woman's special mission, and eloquently and forcibly dwells on her obligations to devote herself to the work which it embraces in the family and in society, and the manner in which she may fit herself for the accomplishment of that work.

PERIODICAL

70739

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

**THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**

